Letters
To Samuel
Austin

BAP
M5715t
Copy1

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB

10176

TWELVE LETTERS

ADDRESSED TO

Rev. SAMUEL AUSTIN, A. M.

IN WHICH

HIS VINDICATION OF PARTIAL WASHING FOR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,

CONTAINED IN

TEN LETTERS,

IS REVIEWED AND DISPROVED.

BY DANIEL MERRILL, A. M.
PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN SEDGWICK.

In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. JESUS CHRIST.

Wo unto you, *lawyers!* for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered. JESUS CHRIST.

BOSTON:
PRINTED AND SOLD BY MANNING & LORING,
NO. 2, CORNHILL.....1806.

District of Massachusetts, to wit.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the eleventh day of April, in the thirtieth year of the independence of the United States of America, Manning & Loring, of the said district, have deposited in this office the title of a Book, the right whereof they claim as Proprietors, in the words following, *to wit:*—"Twelve Letters, addressed to Rev. Samuel Austin, A. M. in which his Vindication of Partial Washing for Christian Baptism, contained in Ten Letters, is reviewed and disproved. By Daniel Merrill, A. M. Pastor of the Church of Christ in Sedgwick."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies during the Times therein mentioned;" and also to an Act, entitled, "An Act supplementary to an Act, entitled, 'An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies, during the Times therein mentioned;' and extending the Benefits thereof to the Arts of Designing, Engraving, and Etching Historical and other Prints."

N. GOODALE, *Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.*

A true Copy of Record. Attest:
N. Goodale, *Clerk.*

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
REC. APR 1881
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

To the Christian Reader.

WHATEVER be your denomination, your wiſdom is, to ſeek the knowledge and practice of the truth. In the following Letters you will find diſcuſſed ſome of the moſt important articles of the Chriſtian religion: ſome of the great and leading points in which Jeſus, as Captain of the Lord's hoſt, aſſerts his kingly authority, are ſet to view; as well as ſome of thoſe in which Antichriſt aſſerts his authority, are expoſed. The highly intereſting contention, at the preſent, is, who ſhall reign over us, and who ſhall give us laws, Chriſt or Antichriſt! The Pope and his clergy, and all who are in part or whole blinded by the ſmoke, the errors, which came out of the bottomleſs pit, Rev. ix. 2. ſay Antichriſt's authority, in whole or part, is founded in the word of God. The author of theſe pages has endeavoured to ſhow, that Antichriſt hath, for his ordinances of ſprinkling, &c. no ſupport from the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt; and that his temporiſing, defiling, and abominable errors, ſo far as they concern the preſ-

ent controverſy, have not one paſſage, from Geneſis to Revelation, in their favour.

The reader will find a ſpirit of extermination manifeſted againſt the errors of Mr. Auſtin: but the reader is deſired not to feel in his own breaſt, nor to ſuppoſe that the author poſſeſſed in his, the ſame ſpirit towards Mr. Auſtin's perſon or character, which is expreſſed towards his errors. The author takes liberty to aſſure every perſon into whoſe hands this pamphlet may fall, that he hath no contemptible idea of Mr. Auſtin's character or talents; nor is he without ſtrong hopes that Mr. Auſtin is, generally ſpeaking, a cordial friend to truth, notwithſtanding he hath embraced and laboured to vindicate ſeveral very hurtful and bewildering errors. All God's children have not as yet obeyed the heavenly command, to come out from the man of ſin, from Antichriſt, to touch not the unclean thing, and be ſeparate.

Whilſt Mr. Auſtin, and many others, who have left the doctrines of the man of ſin, are yet bewildered by ſome of his ordinances, we are not to count them as enemies, but to admoniſh them as friends, and be ever ready to embrace them, the moment in which they will obey our *King*, and come out, and touch not the abominations of the mother of harlots.

There are many who will not enter into the kingdom of heaven themſelves, and thoſe who are entering in by Chriſt's goſpel ordi-

nance, baptism, they hinder. In this matter they defile themselves, and are yet with the *man of sin*, who still hinders the full glory of the church.

Reader, if you will not be baptized yourself, and thus enter into the visible church, the kingdom of heaven on earth, be careful how you hinder those who are entering in. Christ's kingdom must come, and it will come: be careful, lest you be found even to fight against God.

If the errors of sprinkling for baptism, unbelievers for the subjects, and unbaptized persons for church members, be not of Christ, but of the world, reject them as relicks of Antichrist. The following Letters, if read with a prayerful, teachable spirit, will show that the above are errors, not being found in the gospel of Christ, but being contrary from the word of the Son of God.

Reader, are you a Christian, and yet unwilling to know the laws of your King! Do you find that within you there are strong prejudices, and the risings of a corrupt mind, against hearing and practising as the more noble Bereans did, when Paul was the preacher? For Zion's sake, for truth's sake, and for your own sake, remember that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. Have courage and resolution enough to hear and know the truth, and practise it when known.

Praying that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ may give you to see the rising church, as now coming up from the wilderness, showing herself in gospel beauty and simplicity, and to espouse her cause with your whole heart,

I am, reader,
your's and the church's
willing servant,
THE AUTHOR.

SEDGWICK, DECEMBER 25, 1805.

LETTERS

TO

The Rev. SAMUEL AUSTIN.

LETTER I.

REVEREND SIR,

WITH pain and pleasure I continue in the field of theological controversy. It is painful to me, that the time, talents, and zeal of good men, should be occupied to give currency and continuance to error. In the mean time, it is grateful to my feelings to discover the same good men relinquishing, by little and little, their indefensible ground. The concessions and profession, which are found in your Letters to me, furnish hope that you will yet discover truth and embrace it.

You concede,

1. That the present controversy cannot be settled by an appeal to the Greeks or Romans; to the monk of Palestine, Jerome; to the reformer of Geneva, or to the English defender of the Baptists; or even by an appeal to church history, or to any other writings which are merely human.*

2. That when baptism was introduced among the Jews, in the days of John, and in the days of Christ and his apostles, it was not administered to infants; and that the evidence for infant baptism does not, in our day, amount to demonstration.†

3. You concede, that the Bible is the only book by which the present controversy must be settled.‡

4. You concede, that our English translation of the Bible is so perfect, that every argument, which is founded in any degree upon a different translation than what is found in our common Bibles, "has an objection at its foundation."§

* Pages 66, 107 of the Letters to the author.

† Pages 7, 75. ‡ Page 108. § Page 72.

This laſt conceſſion has its importance, not as it reſpects either you or me, but as it reſpects common readers, that they may reſt ſatisfied that the preſent tranſlation is ſufficiently accurate and explicit. Some other conceſſions I may mention, as the ſubject ſhall require.

Your profeſſion, Sir, is excellent, and worthy of a Chriſtian, in every conteſt. It is this: "As for me, I conſider truth infinitely preferable to any party intereſt, and promiſe to you, that I will yield to evidence as ſoon as it is preſented."

It is now expedient that I notice another conceſſion, which you give to the public, in page 7 of your Letters; and in the following words:—"Through the moſt of my miniſtry, though I prevailingly believed that the doctrine and practice of the Pædobaptiſts, generally conſidered, were authorized in the Scriptures, I had not that *full conviction* on *theſe points* which I had reſpecting many other articles. It is not more than three years, ſince by ſome particular incidents, my attention was called up afreſh to the ſubject: I then determined to inveſtigate it as cloſely as my abilities would allow: I accordingly examined the Scriptures from beginning to end—got into my hands and read all the publications on the ſubject which I could command, and the reſult of my inquiries was juſt the reverſe of yours. It appears to me that no *determinate mode* of applying water in baptiſm was clearly pointed out in the Scriptures, or made eſſential to the validity of the ordinance."

This conceſſion of yours, Sir, together with its iſſue, inclines me to relate to you, in this place, and through you to the public, ſome of the providences which led to my conviction, and in the reſult, to my converſion from ſome of my errors.

For nearly ten years after I entertained ſome hope that I was born of the Spirit, I do not recollect of its being once ſuggeſted to my mind, that there was any conſiderable difficulty in ſupporting ſprinkling for baptiſm, and infants for the ſubjects. In the year 1790, whilſt in purſuit of theological knowledge, I had put into my hands a ſhort hiſtory of infant baptiſm, written by a gentleman in New York. This pamphlet produced its witneſſes for infant baptiſm, century preceding century, till it came nearly to the apoſtolic age; but it left a blank, as all other hiſtories of the ſame kind have done, between the period in which we firſt hear of infant baptiſm, and the apoſtles. This deficiency of hiſtoric evidence I ſenſibly felt. This chain of evidence was at the time quite pleaſing to me, ſo far as it went; but it

wanted a few more links to reach to the apoſtles, ſo as to unite their practice and ours together: however, the author did as well as he could, in the cauſe which he was labouring to defend. I was now left to believe, without evidence, if I could, that infant baptiſm came down, in regular ſucceſſion, from the apoſtles to us. This I believed. Not only ſo, but I conſidered infant baptiſm a Bible doctrine, though not quite ſo explicitly expreſſed as I could have wiſhed. From this time I had occaſionally ſome ſmall difficulties; but they were, for the moſt part, but quite ſmall, and of ſhort continuance. The Bible I believed to be full of the doctrine of infant baptiſm, though I knew of no particular place which was fully to the point. I conſidered it to be a very ſingular thing, that we had no example of infant baptiſm. Said I to myſelf, Had there been one example, it would have put the matter beyond a doubt. Whether example or not, ſtill I concluded it muſt be a Bible doctrine: for I *ſuppoſed* that the greateſt of men, that the wiſeſt of men, and that the moſt learned alſo, had always practiſed it: beſides, I took it for granted (for there was no evidence for it) that baptiſm had ſucceeded circumciſion, and that the ſame ſubjects which were of old circumciſed, were now to be baptized. Moreover, there are ſeveral paſſages of the New Teſtament, which have been thought, by great, good, and learned men, to favour infant baptiſm. I thought the ſame. If you, Sir, will have patience with me, I will mention ſome of theſe ſcriptures, and eſpecially thoſe which I viewed as cardinal texts upon the ſubject. I will alſo tell you how I then underſtood them, likewiſe what are my preſent thoughts reſpecting them. The texts which were conſidered to be, more than any other, in favour of infant baptiſm, and which appeared ſufficient to authorize the practice, are the following.

1. Mat. xix. 13, 14, 15. 'Then were there brought unto him little children, that he ſhould put his hands on them, and pray; and the diſciples rebuked them: but Jeſus ſaid, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.'

2. The parallel text, Mark x. 13, 14, 15, 16. 'And they brought young children to him, that he ſhould touch them; and his diſciples rebuked thoſe that brought them: but when Jeſus ſaw it he was much diſpleaſed, and ſaid unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them,

not, for of ſuch is the kingdom of God. Verily I ſay unto you, Whoſoever ſhall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he ſhall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and bleſſed them.'

3. The ſame account, as related by Luke, xviii. 15, 16, 17, was thought to afford ſome additional light. Luke ſays, 'They brought unto him alſo infants, that he would touch them; but when his diſciples ſaw it, they rebuked them: but Jeſus called them unto him, and ſaid, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the kingdom of God. Verily I ſay unto you, Whoſoever ſhall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, ſhall in no wiſe enter therein.'

4. Acts ii. 39. 'For the promiſe is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.'

5. 1 Cor. vii. 14. 'For the unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is ſanctified by the huſband; elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy.'

Upon theſe texts I reaſoned in the following manner.

Little children, young children, and infants were brought to Chriſt; he approved of their being brought; he was diſpleaſed with ſuch as forbade them; we ſhould bring our children to him; what way ſo ſuitable as to preſent them in baptiſm: beſides, Chriſt ſaid, Of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven. How could infants be of the kingdom of heaven, otherwiſe than by being baptized, and ſo admitted members of the viſible church? It was alſo my thought, that the promiſe mentioned Acts ii. 39. was the ſame that was made to Abraham, Gen. xvii.: and, in addition to the above, Paul tells us, that when one of the parents is a believer, the children are holy. Hence, my concluſion was, that infant baptiſm was warranted by Scripture, when not one of the texts ſays ſo much as a word about baptiſm; but each one relates to quite a different ſubject, as you may ſee by examining the connexion of each.

Should more evidence be required, my erroneous judgment was, that houſehold baptiſm, as recorded Acts xvi. 15 and 33. and 1 Cor. i. 16. would make up any deficiency; when in neither of the paſſages is there a word ſaid of any child or adult being baptized upon the faith of another. Upon this foundation, if it may be called a foundation, my faith with reſpect to infant baptiſm, or with reſpect to what is of late years ſo called, reſted, with little interruption, till

the beginning of 1799; at which time I felt ſome heſitancy as to its being ſupported by the oracles of God.

My preſent thoughts with reſpect to the above texts, you will permit me to defer till I write you again; and in the mean time believe me to be

Yours, &c.

LETTER II.

REVEREND SIR,

IN the cloſe of my laſt, the thought was ſuggeſted, that my mind heſitated, in the beginning of 1799, as to the validity of infant baptiſm; it did, however, preponderate in its favour. But in the winter and ſpring of this year, a new ſcene opened to view. At this time a remarkable and extenſive reformation took place among my people; and among the converts, there were not leſs than twenty or thirty who were diſſatisfied with infant baptiſm, and many of them doubted of ſprinkling being the baptiſm of the goſpel. It became my indiſpenſable duty to take up the ſubject, and canvaſs it as well as I could. It was attempted; but I found not my path ſo clear of difficulties as it was wiſhed to be. However, my ignorance and unbelief ſuſtained me for the time: and by not underſtanding, and by miſapplying Mark vii. 4. and by going with the young converts to the water, and there partially waſhing them for baptiſm, their minds were in meaſure ſatisfied. At the ſame time, they had encouragement that the ſubject of baptiſm ſhould be ſoon taken under conſideration again, and that they might expect to have it then more fully and ſatisfactorily explored. Thus the matter apparently reſted with them; but my own mind was not long at a time without queries upon the ſubject. I now read my Bible over and over again; every pamphlet and every page written by any Pædobaptiſt, upon infant ſprinkling, I read with eagerneſs, wherever I could find it; but whenever I lit upon a leaf written in favour of goſpel baptiſm, I either neglected it wholly, or read it with prejudice. My object was not ſo much to know what baptiſm was, as to prove that ſprinkling was baptiſm. I purſued this fruitleſs ſearch for nearly ſix years. At intervals my mind was ſatisfied, largely ſo, that ſprinkling, or rather that partial waſhing, was goſpel baptiſm, and infants

the proper ſubjects; as fully perſuaded of this being the caſe, perhaps, as you were, after three years ſearch. My mind almoſt perpetually gave judgment in favour of infant ſprinkling, and ſeldom, if ever, doubted but it would paſs for baptiſm. I was willingly ignorant of the true goſpel baptiſm. Not only was I willingly ignorant, but, like my Pædobaptiſt brethren, I choſe darkneſs, in this matter, rather than light. I was much like them alſo in another particular, in that I too much ſaid, in both words and practice, that any application of water, in the name of the Lord Jeſus, was baptiſm; and that there was no determinate way, clearly pointed out in the Bible, by which water ſhould be applied. For ſprinkling, as being goſpel baptiſm, I long and vainly ſought; and becauſe I could not find it, I more vainly concluded, that the matter was all left at ſuch looſe ends that nobody could know; and ſo we muſt practiſe, and be agreed about the matter as well as we could. However, my mind could not, for a long period at a time, reſt in this ſtate of groſs darkneſs and ignorance. Beſides, my people did not forget my encouragement, that the ſubject of baptiſm ſhould be again taken up, and more fully handled; nor did they forget to remind me of my promiſe.

But the more I ſtudied on the ſubject, the more I diſcovered my darkneſs, and my unpreparedneſs to treat on it publickly. Whilſt ſearching every where for data to prove ſprinkling or partial waſhing to be baptiſm, it uſed occaſionally to be ſuggeſted, Who are goſpel ſubjects of baptiſm? This became to me a ſerious queſtion in the year 1804. My difficulty was, indeed, not ſmall; yet I thought myſelf juſtified in continuing my practice. In Auguſt of this year, juſt before the adminiſtration of infant ſprinkling, this text ſomewhat forcibly ſtruck my mind, 'He that doubteth is damned if he eat.' In a moment the following thought came to my relief, *I doubt the lawfulneſs of my refuſing to adminiſter.* In this ſtrait, my judgment was, that duty called me to proceed.

The next Lord's day, in the morning, one of my brethren, who had long doubted infant baptiſm, came and requeſted to have his children, eight in number, baptized. This requeſt was at that time to me an unpleaſant one: I heſitated. My conſcience would but barely conſent to the baptiſm of infants.* Here were children of ſufficient age

* I frequently uſe the words, baptiſm and to baptize, in their modern and perverted ſenſe, to ſignify rantiſm and to rantize. It is deſired that the reader will underſtand me, and that the oppoſers of goſpel baptiſm will take no advantage, from the words being thus uſed.

to be taught, and to believe for themſelves. The difficulty which I felt was mentioned to the father of theſe children: he was deſired to wait for an anſwer till the intermiſſion: I then took him, with two of my deacons, and converſed conſiderably upon the ſubject. It was ſomewhat plain to me, and mentioned to them, that, going upon the covenant of circumciſion, it was inconſiſtent to baptize an infant of eight days, and to refuſe another of twice eight years. The more I thought and ſpake on the ſubject, the more my difficulties increaſed. At this juncture, I ſenſibly felt that wiſdom was needed from on high. I mentioned to the two deacons, that it was, in my judgment, expedient that there ſhould be a day of faſting and prayer appointed, that we might, among other requeſts, aſk of God wiſdom and knowledge with reſpect to baptiſm, and the fit ſubjects. The deacons agreed to the expediency of the propoſal, and the brother conſented to defer the baptiſm of his children. Not long after, at a public conference of the brethren, my propoſal was agreed to, and a day was appointed.

The day was ſolemnly obſerved: and with pleaſure I now give information to all whom it may concern, and for the encouragement of my erring brethren, and eſpecially for ſuch as are in ſenſible darkneſs reſpecting the ſubjects of our difficulty, that, to the beſt of my recollection, every brother and ſiſter, who readily united in this day of ſeeking wiſdom of God, hath been favoured with light, and very comfortable ſatisfaction, reſpecting thoſe things concerning which we aſked counſel of God. Our darkneſs and doubts, however, were not removed all at once, but by little and little; and we were ſet at liberty one after another, much as it is in days of reformation.

Several manifeſtly felt no need of wiſdom; they ſtill remain in their traditionary darkneſs.

The day of our faſting and prayer to the Father of Lights, for wiſdom to guide us into the knowledge and practice of his will, being now ended, my mind was ſtill in anxious ſuſpenſe. My thoughts now turned to infant baptiſm. Some expectation I poſſeſſed, that, if nothing could be found for infant ſprinkling, ſomething might for baptizing, that is, for immerſing them. My caſe was ſomewhat like that of a drowning man,—I was diſpoſed to catch at every ſtraw which might aſſiſt in ſaving my traditionary notions from ſinking: ſtill nothing could I find which appeared ſo to comport with the directions and pattern given, as to afford a reſting place.

Both day and night my mind was filled with careful and prayerful meditation. My anxiety increaſed from week to week; ſo did a careful ſearch after the mind and will of God. My darkneſs likewiſe increaſed, till it was darkneſs very ſenſibly to be felt.

For a week or ten days I could diſcern ſcarce a ray of light reſpecting baptiſm, or the ſubjects of baptiſm, from any quarter. Whilſt in this condition, I was apprehenſive that the reſult would be, that I ſhould never know what the goſpel baptiſm is, but ſhould, in this dark and doubtful ſtate, be diſmiſſed from my people, and go preaching the goſpel where I might find a place.

Notwithſtanding all my darkneſs, I ſtill believed that there was ſuch an ordinance as goſpel baptiſm, which ought to be adminiſtered in the uſe of water; and that God was able to ſhow me what it was. But my proud heart, at times, could not endure the thought of being a Baptiſt; however, God, of his infinite mercy, as I now conſider it, kept me as in Egyptian darkneſs, till my proud heart was ſubdued, and my ſtubborn will bowed, and I made willingly to ſay, Lord, not my will, but thine, be done; make me a Pædobaptiſt, a Pædorantiſt, or even a Baptiſt, or any thing, as thou wilt.

Almoſt from this moment the clouds began to ſcatter, and the glorious, the important, the precious light of goſpel baptiſm began to ſhine into my anxious and benighted mind. Directly upon it, I began to write and deliver to my people thoſe Sermons which you have profeſſedly examined.

You will probably conſider me to have poſſeſſed a very proud heart, which could be ſo unwilling to be a Baptiſt. Such a proud heart you, Sir, and many others may poſſeſs, and be as inſenſible of it as I once was. You may imagine, that, were the Baptiſts right, you would as readily be a Baptiſt as any thing: but, Sir, as I once heard a dying woman ſay, "When we are living, we talk of dying; but when death comes, it is another thing:" ſo, whilſt we are upon good terms with the world, we may talk of being Baptiſts; but when the trial comes, it is another thing.

During my days of darkneſs and trial, the texts mentioned in the cloſe of my laſt letter, came, I know not how often, within my view: perhaps I have fifty times turned to one or the other of them, wiſhing them to ſpeak, "infants the ſubjects of goſpel baptiſm." In years paſt I took it for granted that they ſpake this language ſomewhat plainly; but my thoughts upon theſe texts are different for the preſent: they ſhall be now laid before you.

The text in Mat. xix. 13, 14, 15. is, 'Then were there brought unto him little children, that he ſhould put his hands on them, and pray; and the diſciples rebuked them: but Jeſus ſaid, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.'

My thoughts reſpecting this paſſage are,

1. That here is nothing ſaid or intimated, directly or indirectly, about baptizing children upon the faith of their parents, or upon their being the children of believers.

2. Theſe children were not brought for baptiſm, but that Jeſus would lay his hands on them and pray, or bleſs them, as good old Jacob, when dying, bleſſed the ſons of Joſeph.

3. Some ſuch little children, as were brought to Chriſt, are of the kingdom of heaven, and fit ſubjects of it too, as you may ſee in the preceding chapter, ver. 3 and 6, where it is thus written, 'Verily I ſay unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye ſhall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whoſoever ſhall offend one of theſe *little ones*, which *believe* in me.' If you will turn to chap. xxi. 15, 16. you will find theſe *little children* mentioned again; and alſo ſome farther information,—that of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven: it is thus related,—'And when the chief prieſts and ſcribes ſaw the wonderful things that he did, and the *children* crying in the temple, and ſaying, Hoſanna to the Son of David; they were ſore diſpleaſed, and ſaid unto him, Heareſt thou what theſe ſay? and Jeſus ſaith unto them, Yea: have ye never read, Out of the mouth of *babes* and *ſucklings* thou haſt perfected praiſe?'

4. If this paſſage hath any indirect reference to the baptiſm of little children, it is manifeſtly againſt your practice or cuſtom of infant baptiſm; and informs you what children are to be baptized,—ſuch as are fit for the kingdom of heaven, ſuch as believe in Chriſt, or ſuch babes and ſucklings as cry, 'Hoſanna to the Son of David.'

My thoughts are ſimilar, with reſpect to the parallel paſſages, which are related by Mark and Luke.

The text in Acts ii. 39. is, 'For the promiſe is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.

My thoughts on this text are,

1. That the promiſe is unto all, even to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, parents or children.

2. That the thing promiſed was the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, as Peter manifeſtly informs us in the words immediately preceding the text.

3. That the gift of the Holy Ghoſt was what was ſpoken of by the prophet Joel, ii. 28. as quoted by Peter, Acts ii. 17. 'And it ſhall come to paſs in the laſt days, (ſaith God,) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all fleſh; and your ſons and your daughters ſhall propheſy, and your young men ſhall ſee viſions, and your old men ſhall dream dreams.' This is the very promiſe about which Peter had been preaching.

4. That, as Peter ſaid to his hearers, 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt;' ſo it is the duty of all men who hear the goſpel to do likewiſe, and they ſhould receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, to quicken, comfort, and ſeal them: for the promiſe ſtill is to all, parents and children, even to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.

5. That the chapter which contains this text ſufficiently explains it, and renders it not only eaſy to be underſtood, but difficult to miſtake its true meaning.

There is ſcarce a text in the Bible which has been oftener preſſed to the ſervice of infant baptiſm, and there is not one leſs to the purpoſe.

The text in 1 Cor. vii. 14. is, 'For the unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is ſanctified by the huſband; elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy.'

My thoughts, Sir, on this text, are,

1. That it hath nothing to ſay about baptiſm, for it or againſt it. The apoſtle is treating on a ſubject quite aſide from that of baptiſm. The ſubject, as you well know, is about huſbands and wives living together, after one of the parties is converted. The ſubject of baptiſm does not once come to view in the whole matter.

2. The apoſtle tells us, that the infidel huſband is ſanctified, or made holy, as really and as truly ſo, and for aught appears, in the ſame ſenſe of holineſs, as the children are holy. This text, therefore, if you will *make* it relate to baptiſm, proves too much; it proves that the infidel and idolatrous huſband, as well as the children, is to be baptized. This, Sir, you, and every man who is not blinded by ignorance or prejudice, would bluſh to advocate. This text is, therefore, nothing for infant baptiſm.

As to the texts, Acts xvi. 15 and 33. and 1 Cor. i. 16. which ſpeak of the baptiſm of houſeholds, my thoughts of them are,

1. As expreſſed in my Sermons.

2. That theſe texts are totally ſilent about infant baptiſm, and that they would, therefore, be never preſſed in to the ſupport of it, were not that point very difficult of proof.

3. There is, on the whole, no intimation that there was, in either of the houſeholds, any one baptized, without being at the time a viſible believer. As to Lydia's houſehold, we read in the laſt verſe of the chapter of the brethren in her houſe. As to the jailer's,—Paul told him, that if he believed on the Lord Jeſus he ſhould be ſaved, and his houſe. How could they be ſaved, if they did not believe? for 'he that believeth not ſhall be damned:' beſides, we are told in the connexion, that the jailer rejoiced, believing in God with all his houſe.

You are pleaſed to tell me, in your expoſition, "that the Greek participle which is rendered believing, is in the ſingular number." Every Engliſh reader, who is acquainted with the conſtruction of language, knows it is the ſame in our common Bibles: what, therefore, do you gain by referring to the Greek? Should you write again, pleaſe to inform me by what authority you contradict the tranſlators of the Bible, and injure the ſenſe of this text, by telling us, that the jailer believed in God and rejoiced *domeſtically*.

With regard to Stephanas's houſehold, they were addicted to the miniſtry of the ſaints, and this too, for aught appears, from the day of their baptiſm.

The above texts, which are your principal ones, being inſufficient to ſupport infant baptiſm, it muſt fall: for it is a general truth,—The foundation being removed, the ſuperſtructure muſt come down. Theſe texts have been placed, by the Pædobaptiſts, as the foundation of infant baptiſm. Theſe texts ſay nothing about it; yet they ſay as much as does any other in all the Bible. The fair concluſion is, infant baptiſm muſt fall, or ſtand upon nothing: or, which is the ſame thing, it muſt fall, or ſtand upon texts which have no connexion with it, and which ſay nothing about it. We wiſh your denomination would be kind enough to be as ſilent about infant baptiſm, in both precept and example, as is the Bible; then would the controverſy be ended.

Now, Sir, permit me to add a few reflections from what we have paſſed over.

The *firſt* is—When I found "that I had not that full conviction on the points of what is called pædobaptiſm," my courſe of inquiry was very ſimilar to yours; and after I had purſued the ſame courſe three years, my concluſion was the ſame with yours, that the mode of applying water in baptiſm was not very determinately pointed out, but that water applied in almoſt any way might anſwer the intent of the great Inſtitutor. When I had inquired three years more, *faſting* and *prayer being added*, my concluſion was the reverſe.

The *ſecond* is—That the reaſons, and the only reaſons, why I could find no determinate mode of applying water in baptiſm, are theſe: firſt, I would not believe that immerſion was the mode, or was the goſpel baptiſm; and ſecondly, I could find no other mentioned; hence I concluded that none was preſcribed.

Third. You, Sir, having been as I once was, you may be as I now am.

Wiſhing you much light and more grace,

I am, &c.

LETTER III.

REVEREND SIR,

I NOW proceed to examine, as critically and as conciſely as I conveniently can, your examination of my Seven Sermons.

Whilſt your Letters ſhall paſs in review, I ſhall endeavour the ruin of the errors which they contain. But, believe me, Sir, my deſire is, that not ſo much as one ſhaft may be aimed either againſt your perſon, reputation, or piety. My buſineſs is not what you or your denomination are, as to numbers, talents, or piety; but my buſineſs is with your errors, the ways by which you ſupport them, and with the truths which ruin them. Whilſt I write not for you only, but for all who may read, you muſt give me leave to uſe great plainneſs of ſpeech.

The errors which you advocate and I oppoſe, are of ſuch magnitude, and fraught with ſuch evil conſequences to both ſaints and ſinners, that we ſhould poſſeſs all that calmneſs in meditation and expreſſion, which an earneſt contention for the faith will permit.

The errors, Sir, which you plead for, and I againſt, are three:

1. Sprinkling, or partial waſhing, is baptiſm.

2. That manifeſt unbelievers are proper and goſpel ſubjects of baptiſm.

3. That baptiſm is not neceſſary to memberſhip in the viſible church of Chriſt.

Theſe three principles of yours are conſidered to be errors, and at war with the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. You conſider them to be a part of his goſpel. What you have in your Letters ſaid, directly or indirectly, in their favour, it will be a part of my buſineſs to refute. It alſo belongs to me to ſhow the inconcluſiveneſs of your ſuppoſed refutation of my arguments in favour of the three following truths.

1. Immerſion, in the name of the Lord Jeſus, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is the only goſpel baptiſm.

2. No perſon hath a right to goſpel baptiſm, but upon his making a profeſſion of goſpel faith.

3. No perſon is a member of Chriſt's viſible church till he be baptized.

From theſe principles you draw ſome popular objections againſt my ſermons. In the ſecond ſentence of your firſt Letter you ſay, and you meant the world ſhould hear it, "that I muſt now conſider you as one of the antichriſtian world." In the 8th, 9th, and 10th pages you very much enlarge this of all objections the moſt popular. My readers, Sir, ſhall have your objection ſet before them in its full ſtrength: for if it be concluſive againſt my principles, let it deſtroy them; but if it have no weight, let it be ſet down for nothing. Your objection is in the following words:

"Are you ſure that you act under the divine approbation, whilſt merely becauſe I am not a baptized perſon, according to your notion of baptiſm, you place me without, where are dogs, and ſorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whoſoever loveth and maketh à lie? To theſe extremities you are driven, by the radical principle of your book, by holding that complete immerſion is the only Chriſtian baptiſm, and that baptiſm is eſſential to a perſon's being a viſible member of Chriſt's kingdom: and by this principle you ſhut out thouſands with whom, in regard to piety and Chriſtian reſpectability, probably you, certainly I, can claim no compariſon. You enroll among the viſible enemies of God, Leighton, Flavel, Doddridge, Watts, Gardiner, the Edwardses, the Brainerds, and a multitude of eminently

holy men, whoſe names it is impoſſible you ſhould recollect but with deep veneration."

Yes, Sir, I recollect their names with veneration, and their errors with regret. But what hath veneration or regret to do with principles?

I muſt here ſtate three things:

1. That the manner in which you throw the objection before the public, has a very natural tendency to give an incautious reader a very unjuſt idea of the tendency of my principles.

2. That great men and great names can never change truth into a lie.

3. Your argument againſt the juſtneſs of my principles is not ſufficient to prove them wrong.

1. The manner in which you throw the objection before the public, has a very natural tendency to give an incautious reader a very unjuſt idea of the tendency of my principles. He would naturally enough conclude that I muſt, if conſiſtent with myſelf, believe that no one except the Baptiſts has any religion; that I conſider and treat all others as being impenitent and ungodly; yes, as being "profligate and unregenerate." A more unjuſt idea could not be communicated. Such an idea is not only inconſiſtent with my principles, but they forbid any perſon's ſuggeſting that ſuch an idea could fairly be deduced from them. One of our principles is, that no perſon is a fit ſubject of baptiſm, unleſs he be a penitent, a godly, a regenerate perſon.

Beſides, Sir, I am not ſingular, in conſidering men to be not of the viſible church, but viſibly with the world, till they are baptized. This hath ever been the ſentiment of the church. It was always mine, ſince I had any ſentiment on the ſubject.

I will put a caſe. Suppoſe there be a reformation at this preſent time at Worceſter, where you reſide. Suppoſe fifty perſons of the brighteſt talents be converted. Not one of them has been baptized, or even ſo much as ſprinkled. I providentially ride through the town next week. By chance I meet Mr. Auſtin in the ſtreet, and put this queſtion,—Have thoſe very reſpectable characters, who have been of late hopefully converted, joined the church, (meaning the viſible church)? your reply would be ready, No, but ſome of them have paſſed examination, and give full ſatisfaction, who with the reſt will probably join in a ſhort time. Indeed, Sir, you would have no idea of telling me that they belonged to the viſible church, unleſs you are contrary from all men whom

I have ever yet ſeen. It is an offence againſt the common ſenſe of Chriſtians of all denominations, who believe in goſpel ordinances, to advocate, that perſons belong to the viſible church, and yet never baptized. Were your ſide not hard preſſed, you would never think of ſuch an expedient to get out of difficulty.

This being the caſe, the Baptiſts do but conſider and treat you and your denomination, as you do the wiſeſt and moſt pious among yourſelves, till they be baptized. Hence, you can but ſee that you condemn in us what you allow, and almoſt univerſally practiſe among yourſelves. Happy, Sir, is he that condemneth not himſelf in that which he alloweth.

2. Great men and great names can never change truth into a lie.

Suppoſe our principles be ſuch as to lead us to believe, that ſome great and good men, who will not join the viſible church, are not members of it. By the way, this is juſt what you believe yourſelves. Becauſe we believe thus, do you wiſh us to be reproached before all men, as being ſuperſtitiouſly different from all Chriſtians and reaſonable men? Beſides, my dear Sir, what have great and venerable names to do in determining in your favour the truth or falſehood of a principle, when the faith and practice of the ſame great and good men have always been in the face of your theory? Did you not introduce this whole affair, about excluding pious and venerable men from communion, in order to prepoſſeſs the feelings and paſſions of your readers in your favour, before you ventured to try the ſtrength of the goſpel principles, or thoſe which you are pleaſed to term mine? If you did not, I ſee but one other motive which you could have, that is, to make room for a retreat, and ſave for yourſelf a ſtanding in the viſible church, though you might not be able to prove ſprinkling or partial waſhing to be baptiſm, or to refute my arguments for immerſion.

3. Your argument againſt the juſtneſs of my principles is not able to prove them wrong.

Your argument is, Great names and confeſſors. But great names have no authority to overturn principles which are founded on revelation. As to confeſſors, you have none. Not one hath been called to ſuffer in defence of your principles, and againſt mine. If none have ſuffered in defence of your principles, your hoſt of confeſſors are at moſt but great names. Hence, your whole argument is, if my principle be juſt, many great and good men have (through

neglect of duty, for want of light, inclination, or opportunity) never been members of the viſible kingdom or church of Chriſt. Your argument I grant, but deny that it injures my principles. If your argument deſtroy my principles, one of theſe two things is true;—either 1. That there never were any good men among any heathen nation, tribe, or language, where the viſible church of Chriſt was unknown; or 2. That theſe good men belonged to Chriſt's viſible church, where there was none. To aſſert the firſt would be preſumption; to advocate the laſt would be abſurd: hence my principles as yet are out of danger.

Sir, you do not appear fully to comprehend the Baptiſt idea of church membership; it is therefore expedient to come to definitions.

1. None but viſible ſaints are to be baptized.

2. Every baptized perſon, ſo long as he manifeſts himſelf to be a viſible ſaint, is a member of the viſible church.

3. Every baptized perſon, who joins himſelf to a ſociety of baptized believers, is a member of a particular viſible church.

In your note, pages 12 and 13, you ſee fit to contradict what appears to have been the general, if not the univerſal, ſentiment of the church in all ages of Chriſtianity, and the ſentiment of the Bible too, as I expect to make manifeſt. This, your contradiction againſt the church of God, and againſt his word, conſiſts in your denying that baptiſm is the ordinance of introduction into the viſible church of Chriſt, or is neceſſary to a viſible ſtanding in it.

Your note in pages 18 and 19, was probably conſidered by you, and will be by many of your readers, as containing a difficulty which I ſhould not be able to get rid of handſomely. I will tranſcribe the paſſage in which the apparent and ſuppoſed difficulty is contained.

"Mr. Merrill (ſay you) tells us, page 51, that John baptized none but ſuch as brought forth viſible fruits of repentance. Theſe perſons he was making ready for the Lord; when prepared, they were to compoſe that kingdom, or the beginning of that kingdom, which ſhall never be deſtroyed. He adds, It appears to be this kingdom which was now at hand, almoſt ready to be ſet up, of which Chriſt ſpake to Nicodemus, when he ſaid, John iii. 5. 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But this is to concede, either that John's baptiſm was not Chriſtian baptiſm, but of an entirely different nature, or that baptiſm does not introduce into the king-

dom, as a line of ſeparation, &c.; for after theſe multitudes were baptized, according to the repreſentation of Mr. Merrill, they were only made ready for the kingdom, which had not yet even a being. Here, then, he gives up his darling doctrine."

As to this difficulty, in which you conſider me now to be, let it be remarked,

1. That it puts me not to the leaſt difficulty as to the principal point in debate, namely, That no perſon can be a member of Chriſt's viſible church, till he be baptized; for theſe perſons were confeſſedly of this deſcription.

2. "It puts my darling doctrine," as you expreſs it, not to the leaſt hazard, any more than the peculiar circumſtances of the firſt ſetting up of Chriſt's viſible kingdom would, and muſt manifeſtly have done, on ſuppoſition that my darling doctrine were perfectly true, and ſo my ſentiment correct. For, does not an examination by an authorized officer, and the enliſting of the examined perſon, conſtitute him a ſoldier? Yet the firſt perſon ſo enliſted cannot be ſaid to belong to the army; nor can he belong to it till numbers more are enliſted, and the army organized. At the ſame time, theſe very things, his examination and enliſting would, after the army is conſtituted, be conſidered as the introductory and indiſpenſable pre-requiſites. The application is eaſy, and the concluſion this,—That I have no neceſſity of conceding to either of the things which you ſuppoſe; either that John's baptiſm is not Chriſtian baptiſm, or that baptiſm does not introduce into the kingdom, as a line of ſeparation.

3. Were it ſo that the quotations which you make would crowd me, even as cloſely as you ſuppoſe, ſtill your own principles would ſtand in the moſt hazardous poſition, and muſt receive the firſt ſhock. For, ſay you, pages 12, 13, ſpeaking of what initiates into the viſible church, "It is that evidence, whatever it be, which is furniſhed by the ſubject, or by God himſelf, that a man is a ſaint." It is a given truth, Sir, that many of John's diſciples furniſhed this evidence, when they were but in part made ready, that is, before they were baptized. Hence your principle brings you to this ſelf contradictory concluſion, that perſons are members of Chriſt's viſible church, and at the ſame time are not made ready for him. For it was by preaching the baptiſm of repentance, and by baptizing the penitents, that John made ready a people prepared for the Lord. Here is, upon your own principles, a difficulty, which I know not

how to ſurmount or remove; whereas upon mine there is none, unleſs it be a little more explanation is wanted.

The penitents who were baptized of John, were made ready and prepared for the viſible church; or they were the unorganized beginnings of it. As two, or as twenty, approved and enliſted ſoldiers, who are thus made ready and prepared for an army, which is about to be formed, are not the army, unleſs it be the unorganized beginnings of it; ſo, or in a ſimilar ſituation, are John's firſt diſciples, if not the whole of them, conſidered to have been.

In your ſecond Letter you aſk me perhaps a dozen queſtions, and ſtate a particular caſe. I have been, and am ſtill, rather at uncertainty, whether you propoſed them ſeriouſly or not.

If you be ſerious in the inquiries,—"What do we conſider the characters of our candidates for baptiſm to be?—What ſhould we think of a perſon who propoſed to be baptized, and afterwards ſhould, from principle or from an erroneous conſcience, refuſe?—Whom do we conſider to be members of the viſible church, &c.?" Our anſwer is,—1. We conſider our candidates for baptiſm to be viſible ſaints. 2. A perſon who has agreed to be baptized, and ſhould afterwards, merely from error of judgment, refuſe to be, would ſtill be conſidered a viſible ſaint; but, at the ſame time, we ſhould believe him to be for the preſent not fit for the kingdom of heaven, for he, having put his hand to the plough, looked back. 3. All viſible ſaints, who have been baptized, we eſteem to be members of Chriſt's viſible church, and none elſe.

Theſe anſwers, Sir, being carefully attended to, will ſolve all other queſtions upon the ſubject.

Wiſhing you light to ſee the truth, and grace to practiſe it,

I am, &c.

LETTER IV.

REVEREND SIR,

THE buſineſs now on hand is, to review your examination of my definitions and arguments, which relate to what is Chriſtian baptiſm.

On ſuppoſition that your examination has been candid, critical, and impartial, you have nothing to fear from its

being carefully reviewed. If your examination of my definitions and arguments ſhould be found to be neither candid, critical, nor impartial, the public will in the iſſue diſcover where the fault lies, and attach blame where it belongs.

The preſent point in debate you define well, pages 19, 20. Say you, "The debate is confined to a ſingle point: it is this,—Whether a complete immerſion of the body in water, ſo that it ſhall be buried or overwhelmed in water, be the only Chriſtian baptiſm?" This is the thing which you deny, but it is what I conſider to be already fairly gained, and from which I expect to remove all your objections, which have any plauſibility againſt it.

Permit me to make an obſervation or two, and then I ſhall proceed to the buſineſs before us. The firſt obſervation is, "It ſeems (ſay you) very extraordinary that immerſion, as the only Chriſtian baptiſm, ſhould be ſo clearly and unambiguouſly taught, as much or more ſo than any Chriſtian duty; alms-giving, for inſtance, about which there never was any diſpute; and yet yourſelf, and ſuch a multitude of pious, learned, and reſpectable miniſters, and the pureſt and moſt enlightened part of the Chriſtian church, ſince the reformation, ſhould ſo long remain unconvinced and unreclaimed."

Was there never any diſpute about alms-giving? If not, whence, I pray you, ariſes the large quantity of warm converſation which there has ſometimes been in the world about alms-giving, for the poor, and other charitable uſes? Some are complained of for their covetouſneſs, when alms are requeſted; ſome for their too great liberality: ſome will be offended becauſe alms are requeſted: ſome affirm that giving money or goods to ſuch or ſuch a perſon, is alms-giving; others will deny that it is: ſome will contend, that to give property for this purpoſe or for that purpoſe, is alms-giving; others are confident that it is no deed of charity to part with one's money to promote ſuch purpoſes: others ſtill may be found, who will not allow that any Chriſtian duty of alms-giving is performed, unleſs a Chriſtian temper be exerciſed in the performance. Perhaps there is ſcarce a religious duty, except baptiſm, about which there has been more diſpute, among Papiſts and Proteſtants, and among Baptiſts and Pædobaptiſts, than the duty of alms-giving. It ſeems extraordinary that you ſhould not have known this; and had you known it, you could not have mentioned the duty of alms-giving, with the leaſt reaſonable expectation, that by it you ſhould be able to refute my idea of the clearneſs and

explicitneſs of the duty of Chriſtian baptiſm by immerſion. Perhaps you may reply, "I meant, there was never any diſpute about there being ſuch a Chriſtian duty as alms-giving." Should this be granted as a general truth, it is equally true that there has been as little diſpute about the exiſtence of ſuch a Chriſtian duty as baptiſm. It may be well to remark, that it never has been denied in any age, by any denomination of Chriſtians, but immerſion is Chriſtian baptiſm, when it has been adminiſtered by a proper perſon, and to a ſuitable ſubject. Juſt the ſame is true with reſpect to alms-giving, *mutatis mutandis*.

As to the "multitude of pious, learned, and very reſpectable miniſters, and the pureſt and moſt enlightened part of the Chriſtian church, ſince the reformation, remaining ſo long unconvinced and unreclaimed," I beg leave to refer you to my Letters on open communion with all who keep the ordinances as Chriſt delivered them to the ſaints.

The other obſervation which I have to make, relates to a paſſage in your 22d page: it is this,—"If the terms which are uſed by Chriſt and his apoſtles, when referring to this ordinance, have one uniform, unambiguous meaning, which determines baptiſm to be immerſion, and the concurrent language and facts of ſcripture coincide with and ſupport this meaning, the point is ſettled. We are not *left* to *act at diſcretion*. To make this evident, is the object which you ſet yourſelf to accompliſh."

Very well, Sir, and it is the object which I am now writing to accompliſh, and if the Lord will, I ſhall inſtrumentally make ſome progreſs towards its accompliſhment.

Now, Sir, for a review of your examination, pages 22, 23. Your profeſſedly critical examination is thus introduced: "You begin (ſay you to me) by what you call defining the terms, and by detailing to us all the paſſages in the New Teſtament which ſpeak on the ſubject of baptiſm. Your firſt word is *baptiſterion*, the ſignification of which is, a font, a bath, a waſhing place, a veſſel to waſh the body in. Very well," ſay you. Juſt below you add, "If it (i. e. *baptiſterion*) were in an hundred places in the New Teſtament, it would furniſh no evidence in proof of your propoſition." *Anſ.* Let us, Sir, for one moment, turn the tables, and ſuppoſe that *baptiſterion* favours *ſprinkling*, as it now favours immerſion, and that the definition of it were, a baſon, a porringer, a ſprinkling place, a veſſel to ſprinkle the face from; would here be no circumſtantial evidence in favour of ſprinkling? Would not this ſingle word, on ſuppoſition that it favoured

your practice as it does ours, be more evidence for you than you are now able to collect from all writings, either human or divine? Yet it furniſhes, ſay you, no (circumſtantial) evidence for us. I mentioned it as a mere circumſtance in our favour; the reader will judge whether it be ſo. My next words defined were *baptiſma* and *baptiſmos*, the Engliſh of which is baptiſm, waſhing, ſacred ceremonial waſhing. Here, Sir, you ſeparated, in the laſt part of my definition, what I wiſh to have underſtood as being joined together. The three laſt words are exegetical or explanatory of the firſt, and ſhew the kind of waſhing which I intend. I know not how you could ſo miſtake my meaning, as to ſuppoſe that I intended common waſhing. If the definition itſelf were ſo expreſſed that it was poſſible to miſtake my meaning, yet what was ſaid afterwards, in many places, ſhow that I could have no ſuch intention as you intimate; indeed, it could not but have been obvious that my meaning was not common waſhing: for the fact is, as I endeavoured to ſhow, and hope moſt plainly to ſhow, that the Greek words for baptiſm and to baptize have no ſuch meaning in the Bible as common waſhing. I find no place in your Letters where you ſhow that they have; and I expect to ſhow that they have not.

You aſk, "But is there no ſacred ceremonial waſhing beſides immerſion?" *Anſ.* No, not where *baptiſma*, *baptiſmos* or *baptizō* is in the original.

Your obſervation upon *baptiſtēs*, my third word defined, is, "You know that this word ſimply means a baptizer." But, Sir, the queſtion is, What is a baptizer? I explained or defined it, one who dips, a Baptiſt; I now add, it is, ſtrictly ſpeaking, a Baptiſt miniſter, or one who adminiſters the ordinance of baptiſm, or one who immerſes. Why did you omit my definition? was it becauſe you ſaw no plauſible refutation?

In the next place, I defined *baptizō* to mean, when rendered into Engliſh, to baptize, to dip all over, to waſh.

To baptize is, indeed, a Greek word, ſupplied with an Engliſh termination.

Upon my definition you make the following remark: "The firſt and the laſt of theſe definitions, it appears to me, you might as well have omitted." No, Sir, I might not as well have omitted either, or eſpecially the laſt; for then you might juſtly have complained, but now complaint is aſide, for I gave my definitions full; I did it purpoſely: I gave you all to which you could make any honourable pre-

tenſions, ſo that when theſe were ſhown to ſpeak nothing for your practice, but wholly for ours, you might put in no farther claim; but as you have, your claim muſt be examined.

"Your definitions of the word *louō*, to waſh, to rinſe, to bathe, (ſay you to me) ſeem as little to contribute to ſupport your hypotheſis, becauſe it is indiſputable that we often waſh, rinſe, and bathe, without immerſing totally under water the thing or body waſhed, rinſed, or bathed." But do we ever waſh, rinſe, or bathe by *ſprinkling?*

I have no where told the public that *louō* always implied immerſion, nor did I ever intend to communicate ſuch an idea. It was and is ſtill quite ſufficient for my purpoſe, to find that *louō* is never uſed in the Bible, or in the New Teſtament, to mean any thing ſhort of bathing a body or thing all over.

"But now," ſay you, page 25, "for your proof of the ſpecific, uniform, unambiguous meaning of the word *baptizō*, as ſignifying total immerſion. You ſay, page 37, 'the plain, literal meaning and common ſignification of the word is to immerſe, overwhelm, dip, or plunge all over; and that there appears to be no evidence that it is ever uſed ſo much as once, in any part of the Bible, to ſignify the application of water in any other ſenſe.' But this is not proof, my dear Sir, it is your aſſertion. I am conſtrained to deny the correctneſs of it." *Auſt.* Then, Sir, we may expect to find that in your Letters the matter ſtands corrected. We will proceed in the review.

In the 26th page of your Letters, the public is informed, that the "ſtrict truth, however, is, that it (*baptizō*) does not ſignify any manner of applying water, but only the application of it in general." I confeſs, Sir, that this aſſertion, coming from a man of your ſenſe, education, and veracity, is a little to be wondered at. But if this aſſertion be ſupportable, we may undoubtedly expect to find it proved in ſome of your Letters; that *baptizō* is uſed in ſome one inſtance in which it ſhall manifeſtly mean ſome application of water which does not and cannot imply immerſion. We hope to examine carefully.

Your next words are ſufficiently noticeable: they are theſe,—"As your initial proof is thus found to conſiſt in mere aſſertion, I had thought of leaving it, as ſufficiently refuted by a contrary aſſertion." This, Sir, brings to my mind what Ahab ſaid to Benhadad, 'Let not him that girdeth on the harneſs boaſt himſelf as he that putteth it off.'

The next buſineſs which you undertake, is to make, in my judgment, an unnatural and a ſomewhat dangerous *addition* to every text of Scripture in which the word *baptizō* is uſed. To each you add, *by affuſion*. This buſineſs, which fills your pages from the 27th to the 33d, I ſhall leave to the reflection of your readers, and turn my attention to your own obſervations on what you had done. It is pleaſing, my dear Sir, that you do not appear fully ſatisfied with what you have done: I deſire that you may be leſs and leſs ſatisfied, till you ſhall be altogether diſſatisfied.

You conclude that the connexion in which the word *baptizō* is uſed, does not preclude the poſſibility of baptiſm being adminiſtered by affuſion. You do not intimate in your premiſes, from which you draw your concluſion, that there is a *probability* that the ordinance was ever adminiſtered by affuſion, but that there is a *poſſibility*. Hence you conclude, "that if this be admitted as a *poſſible* thing, it is evident that my aſſertion, reſpecting the uniform, excluſive meaning of the word, as ſignifying immerſion, and that only, is entirely without foundation."

Here, Sir, either your judgment or mine is incorrect: for in my judgment, I may admit your premiſes, without fearing the concluſion. I would reſt the whole cauſe, or had I liberty, I might ſafely do it, upon this ſingle point, that it ſhould be forſaken, *if your premiſes, upon their being true*, would harm it. Your premiſes are,—firſt, that there is a *poſſibility*, *from the connexion* in which *baptizō* is uſed, that baptiſm was adminiſtered by affuſion; ſecondly, that there is no *probability*, from *the connexion* in which *baptizō* is uſed, that it was ever adminiſtered in that way.

Now, Sir, can you have a ſingle query in your mind, whether a goſpel ordinance, which hath nothing for its authority but poſitive precepts, may not be duly adminiſtered, according to the precepts and pattern given, when it is, at the ſame time, adminiſtered in a manner which cannot be ſupported, even by a probability ariſing from ſo much as one text out of fifty, which contain precepts or examples relative to the poſitive ordinance enjoined? In all ſuch moral caſes, where, from the connexion of any poſitive law or ordinance, there may be a poſſibility of any certain thing being enjoined, yet if there be no probability of it, it amounts to a moral demonſtration, that no ſuch duty was or is enjoined, unleſs we would reflect the higheſt reproach upon the Lawgiver.

All which I need to eſtabliſh the point, with all who ſuitably honour the Scriptures and the Chriſtian Lawgiver, is, to prove that the literal, the plain, the common ſenſe of the Scripture is, that to be buried or overwhelmed in water is the only Chriſtian baptiſm. Ten thouſand poſſibilities for any thing elſe, ariſing from the connexion of any text in which the word *baptizō* is uſed, would not alter the matter an hair's breadth.

Beſides, Sir, you confeſs that in ſome inſtances there appears an *harſhneſs* in the ſupply, by affuſion, ariſing from the connexion: and you do not preſume to ſay that it is eaſy and natural in any, ſave in thoſe paſſages which refer to the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt; of which ſay you, *water baptiſm* is *undoubtedly* a *ſymbol*. Hence, if I prove from your own conceſſions, that the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt means immerſion or overwhelming, you will yield the point in controverſy, or renew it under increaſed diſadvantages.

Now, Sir, to the *point*. What is the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, judging from your own conceſſions, as well as from the word of God? Your Letters to me ſhall give the anſwer.

Speaking of Rom. vi. 4. you ſay, page 45, "The ſpiritual, internal baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, exactly coincides with the whole of his (the apoſtle's) repreſentation, and invariably produces the effects he mentions."

In page 48, ſpeaking of Col. ii. 12. your words are, "It is juſt like the other," i. e. it is juſt like the above paſſage, Rom. vi. 4.

In the paſſage which we have been juſt conſidering, pages 33, 34, you tell us, "Water baptiſm is undoubtedly a ſymbol of the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, which is a figurative baptiſm;" pages 60, 61.

In page 60 you have theſe words,—"There muſt be ſome *evident likeneſs* between the ſubject to which a word is applied, in the natural and primitive uſe of it, and the ſubject to which it is applied as a figure; otherwiſe there is a *groſs impropriety* in the figurative uſe of it."

Now, Sir, permit me to put theſe ideas, conceſſions, and declarations of yours together.

1. To be *buried* with Chriſt in baptiſm, to be planted in the *likeneſs* of his death, to be *buried* with him by baptiſm, and to be riſen with him in baptiſm, Rom. vi. 4, 5. and Col. ii. 12. is to be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt; or the "baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt exactly coincides with this repreſentation."

2. "There is an *evident* likeneſs between the natural idea of *planting*, *burying*, and *riſing* as from the dead, and the figurative baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, or there is a *groſs impropriety* (as you ſay) in the apoſtle's figurative uſe of the words."

3. Water baptiſm is a ſymbol or figure of the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt; it is, therefore, a burying, a planting, or immerſion,—your Letters, as well as the word of God, being judge.

Hence, Sir, by going a large diſtance round, to avoid what you feared, you have proved, to my hand, what I endeavoured to eſtabliſh through the courſe of five ſermons.

Though I approve of the concluſion to which you have brought me, yet I cannot ſay that I conſent to all your premiſes. You appear to me to be incorrect, in ſetting down the paſſages in Rom. vi. 4, 5. and Col. ii. 12. as containing inſtances of the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt. Should you ever in the world be a thorough Baptiſt, or if not, when the light of heaven ſhall give you light, you will, if I miſtake not, ſee very clearly water baptiſm pointed out in both theſe chapters.

If you can honeſtly get by the above argument, and ſtill retain your ground, I wiſh you to: but ſhould the argument be found impaſſable, then cheerfully concede that truth is ſtronger than man, and yield to her ſovereign mandate. He who is willingly conquered by truth, is a conqueror himſelf.

I am ſincerely yours, &c.

LETTER V.

REVEREND SIR,

IN your fourth Letter you manifeſtly diſcovered a diſlike to my aſſertions and arguments. In this I propoſe to give my readers ſome ſhort notices of what I did, both as to argument and aſſertion; and alſo ſet to view how you attempted to wind yourſelf out, and how, by the attempt, you have wound yourſelf up in them.

My firſt argument, to prove that the Greek word *baptizō* means to immerſe, bury, &c. was—The moſt learned critics in the Greek and Engliſh languages, bear their united teſtimony, generally ſpeaking, againſt your practice, againſt their

own, and for the Baptiſts, that the common, the plain, the literal ſenſe of the word is as I had given it. Your reply is, "To have recourſe to ſuch miſerable authorities, to determine relative to an eſſential and excluſive article of Chriſtian doctrine, is not the moſt reſpectful treatment of the great Inſpirer of the Bible." The only end which I had to anſwer, by quoting the definitions and critical remarks of critical and learned men, was to aſcertain the definition of a word. Do you ſuppoſe, Sir, that I and the reſt of your readers, were all of us born with innate notions, anſwering to all the ideas meant to be communicated by all the Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Greek words in the Bible? If this be not your belief, then you know that you and I, and our readers too, muſt gain ſome of our firſt knowledge from critics, or from compilers of dictionaries, lexicons, and other writings of men, &c. When we have gained what knowledge is at hand, as to the meaning of any word, and our conſequent duty, as related by the beſt of men; yet if there be any more ſure word of prophecy, we ſhould, as did the Bereans, take heed to it. Accordingly I did in the ſecond place turn to the word of the Lord, in which I found it thus written, Mark i. 5. 'And there went out unto him (John) all the land of Judea, and they of Jeruſalem, and were all baptized of him IN the river of Jordan.' Thus, Sir, by comparing the teſtimony of learned men and the ſure word of prophecy together, I find they both agree, and therefore believe both.

But, Sir, what ſhall I ſay to your reply? Shall I tell the learned world that Mr. S. Auſtin, who would not allow me to conjoin the teſtimony of learned critics with that of the word of God, in order to make ſure the definition of a word which he is diſpoſed to controvert, dares himſelf to confront plain Scripture with many great but nameleſs critics? Shall I tell it in Aſkelon, or publiſh it in Gath, that the ſame Mr. Auſtin, who will not allow a dictionary, lexicon, or concordance, each ſanctioned by the learned world, to ſay one word, dare ſpoil the plain, literal, common, and only ſenſe of a plain paſſage of Scripture, when all the authority which he pretends to poſſeſs is, that it is the opinion of many great critics, that John actually did baptize IN the river of Jordan by *affuſion?* Shall I tell the ſame learned world, that the ſame Mr. Auſtin aſſerts, in his public Letters to me, page 35, "That the ſuppoſed evidence of this paſſage muſt lie wholly in the prepoſition IN, and that applies to John as really as to the ſubjects of his adminiſtration?" "Nay, (ſays Mr. Auſtin)

it eſpecially relates to *him;* the conſequence is obvious,—it is, that John was immerſed at every adminiſtration of the ordinance." A perſon who can aſſert thus roundly, without ſo much as a ſhow of evidence, and call it arguing, may be expected to find ſome fault with the aſſertions and pretended arguings of his opponents. But, Sir, I have a little more to ſay of this argument of yours, by which you would deſtroy my evidence from Scripture. You ſay, "This conſequence is too unpleaſant to be eaſily received." What conſequence? The one which you had juſt drawn, "That John was himſelf immerſed at every adminiſtration of the ordinance." This conſequence you draw from your own premiſe, "that the prepoſition IN relates eſpecially to John," together with my definition of *baptizō*, that it is to immerſe. Now take your own premiſe and your own definition, if you have any, or take your aſſertion, that *baptizō* is a generic term, and means not any particular kind of waſhing, but waſhing in general, or any application of water: and what is the conſequence? "The conſequence may be unpleaſant, and too unpleaſant to be eaſily received:" but as unpleaſant as it may be, I ſhall ſet it down, and the world will judge on which ſide the unpleaſantneſs falls. The conſequence is—If John baptized by affuſion every time he adminiſtered the ordinance, he affuſed or poured water on himſelf: if he baptized by ſprinkling, then at every adminiſtration he was ſprinkled himſelf: if he uſed water in any other way, in the adminiſtration of the ordinance, in the ſame way the water came on himſelf. Thus, Sir, your own argument makes nonſenſe of John's baptiſm, take it in any way which you pleaſe. Either John's baptiſm muſt be given up in whole, or your method of managing it.

In page 36, you are pleaſed to expreſs yourſelf thus: "You next, for lack of proof, go on to repeat your aſſertions." And how do you know "*it was for lack of proof?*" Is it always the caſe with you, when in your ſermons you recapitulate ſome particulars which you had paſſed over, that you do it for *lack of proof?* If not, your accuſation againſt me may not be well founded. A little afterwards, ſpeaking of my recapitulation, you ſubjoin, "My dear Sir, repetitions and aſſertions are not arguments. We aſk of you proof." Proof, Sir, you may expect; proof of two kinds: proof that your examination of my Sermons was not well founded, and proof that no ſimilar oppoſition will be able to injure the leading ſentiments which they contain.

My third argument was to this purport: *Baptizō* and *baptiſmos*, though they be moſt uſually rendered to baptize and baptiſm, yet they ſometimes ſignify to waſh; but when this is their ſignification, the waſhing ſpoken of is never common waſhing, but ceremonial; which is bathing the thing in water, or putting it all over in water. Upon this you ſee fit to obſerve, in not a very handſome manner, thus, "But how you could ſtumble upon this, as an argument, is incomprehenſible."

My readers, Sir, can generally underſtand me. As to this argument, which you ſay is incomprehenſible, I will ſet it before you with mathematical plainneſs. *Baptizō* and *baptiſmos* equal two tranſlations, baptizing and a certain kind of waſhing; this certain kind of waſhing equals ceremonial waſhing, which is to bathe a thing all over in water, or to put into water, Lev. xi. 32.; to bathe a thing all over in water, or to put into water, equals immerſion: therefore, to baptize equals to immerſe, and immerſion equals baptiſm. But, Sir, your anſwer is ready, and it is this,—"*Baptizō* equals *niptō*, and *niptō* equals common waſhing." Now, Sir, ſhow me in any paſſage of the New Teſtament, where this ſhort chain of yours, of only three links, is ſupported, or can be by plain affirmation or fair deduction, and I will confeſs that I have run my claim too high. It is eaſy to ſhow you where you will go for proof, and it is equally eaſy to ſhow you that it is not in point. You will directly repair to Mark vii. or to Luke xi. Very well. What do you find here? In Mark you find, that the Phariſees, except they waſh they eat not; this was a conſtant ceremony among them, and *niptō* is uſed. And when they come from the MARKET, except they waſh (baptize, or bathe themſelves all over in water) they eat not. This is their extraordinary ceremony or tradition. This was to be obſerved when they had been to the *market*, or to a promiſcuous aſſembly, where clean and unclean perſons were aſſembled. This takes up the paſſages in Luke xi. as well as Mark vii. Now, Sir, you, and thoſe who have written before you on your indefenſible ground, would palm it upon both learned and unlearned, upon both ſaint and ſinner, that the circumſtances are ſo ſimilar, in which *niptō* and in which *baptizō* are uſed, that the words are equivalent, when the very texts themſelves intimate to you that it is no ſuch thing. One half of your ſuppoſed ſtrength, and imaginary triumph, is founded upon your miſtaking, or willingly not underſtanding, the above paſſages. Would you bring us half ſo much evi-

dence for you, as there is in theſe two paſſages againſt you, we would allow you ſomething plauſible. But, Sir, till you ſhow us where *baptizō* and *niptō* are equivalent, we wiſh you would ſay leſs about it, and take leſs credit for the ſuppoſed equivalency of them. Equate them, or make them equal, if you can: when you do it, we will be ſilent, or make conceſſions: till you do this, common civility impoſes ſilence on you. The other half of your ſuppoſed ſtrength, I hope to remove out of your way as I come to it.

The next thing which requires to be noticed, in your examination, is my definition of the word *louō*, and your obſervations relating to my definition. My definition of *louō* was, and ſtill is, to bathe or waſh a thing all over. You add to my words, and ſay "that I intend immerſion." I do not; nor did I ever intend to define *louō* as always meaning immerſion. All which I have ſaid is this, that *louō* always imports a waſhing of the thing or ſubject all over. You ſubjoin, "If I will turn to John xiii. 10. I ſhall find evidence directly and concluſively againſt this idea." Againſt what idea? Againſt immerſion. This idea of immerſion, as being the excluſive ſenſe of *louō*, I never advocated. But we will take the text into conſideration: it is this,—'Jeſus ſaith to him, He that is waſhed (*ō leloumenos*) needeth not ſave to waſh his feet, but is clean every whit.' Here you ſay, "the man is waſhed, when only his feet are waſhed." Do you mean to contradict the text? or, Do you mean that the text, by a figure of ſpeech, which puts a part for the whole, ſays the man is waſhed, when it intends the feet only are waſhed? The text does not appear to be perfectly eaſy to be underſtood; its purport appears to be, either *firſt*, That Peter had already been baptized, (*leloumenos*) and ſo now had no need to have his body, as Paul expreſſes it, waſhed with pure water; but it was ſufficient for the object that the Saviour had at this time in view, that his feet be waſhed,—as that would be ſufficient to manifeſt the Saviour's condeſcenſion, and to teach his followers humility: or, *ſecondly*, The meaning might be, that *leloumenos* referred, by a figure, to the waſhing of the man, when it intended the waſhing of the feet only. But upon either ſuppoſition, it comes to the ſame thing, as to my argument from it, unleſs you can ſhow that the feet were but partially waſhed. For all which I ſay or wiſh to maintain is, that whenever *louō* is uſed to import the waſhing of any thing whatever, it intends that the thing is waſhed all over. Should you upon this conceſſion ſay, and I grant it in this inſtance, and in

many more, that *louō* and *niptō* are equivalent; would it either help you or harm me; would it be to your purpoſe at all? If you conſider it to be ſo, I will grant it; for I purpoſe to allow you every inch of ground to which you can apparently make any juſt claim.

We muſt now compare things accurately.

Baptizō is equal to immerſion, and to nothing ſhort of it. *Louō* is ſometimes equal to *baptizō*; then *louō* is ſometimes equal to immerſion, as when Paul ſays, our bodies (*leloumenoi*) waſhed with pure water. *Louō* is ſometimes equal to *niptō*; *niptō* is equal to the waſhing of part of the human body; therefore, and what? This, Sir,—firſt, that *niptō* and *louō* may have the ſame import; and ſecondly, that when *niptō* and *louō* agree, they neither of them agree with *baptizō*; therefore, and what? This, Sir,—that your argument comes to juſt what it ſhould, to nothing.

Would you obtain the leaſt advantage from the ſignification of the word *louō*, you muſt prove one of theſe two things,—either 1. That *louō* never intends immerſion, and yet is ſometimes equivalent to *baptizō*; or 2. That *louō*, in ſome certain place or places, where it is ſubſtituted for *baptizō*, ſignifies not immerſion, but ſomething ſhort of it. But could you do this, which you neither have done nor can do, ſtill nothing would be gained, unleſs it be this, that it would embarraſs my principle, without helping your own; for neither *baptizō*, *louō*, nor *niptō*, is ever uſed for *rantizō* or for *ſprinkling*.

You proceed, Sir, in your examination, to tell us, "That it is not probable that the dead body of Dorcas was immerſed; that it would have been a bad way to have immerſed Paul and Silas, in order to bathe their ſtripes; and you can hardly perſuade yourſelf, that the cuſtom, in thoſe days, of waſhing the ſow from her filth, was to immerſe thoſe animals."

All this trouble, Sir, you have, either through my fault, in expreſſing myſelf without ſufficient perſpicuity, or through yours, in adding to my words; for I never intended any ſuch thing. What I wiſhed for is juſt this,—To ſhow that *louō* never meant any thing leſs than the waſhing of the body or thing all over. The world muſt judge, and we ſhall both one day, whether you have deduced a ſingle circumſtance to invalidate the idea which I advanced; if you have not, my Sermons yet appear uninjured by your examination.

One paſſage which I paſſed over, in page 39, I will here mention, leſt you ſhould imagine that I wiſh to avoid it, on

account of ſome apparent difficulty. You expreſs it thus: "If you will turn to Rev. i. 5. you will find another example, clearly againſt what you aſſert, reſpecting *louō*. The word is *loloufanti*. You will not pretend that Chriſt ever waſhed his people in his own blood by immerſing them in it; this is a natural impoſſibility: the word here I grant is uſed figuratively." Very well, Sir, and are they not cleanſed thoroughly? If ſo, they are figuratively waſhed all over. This is all that I aſk you to grant.

Your other obſervations, in your fourth Letter, are ſuppoſed to be anſwered, and ſo ſufficiently reviewed by what is already ſaid.

I will now ſtate the buſineſs, ſo far as it appears to ſtand for the preſent unembarraſſed by your examination. *Baptizō* is to immerſe, bury, overwhelm, &c.; *louō* never means any thing leſs than to waſh a thing all over. The Holy Spirit hath made uſe of both theſe words, and of theſe only, with their derivatives, except in John iii. 5. to deſignate baptiſm: hence, baptiſm can mean nothing leſs than waſhing the body all over, or immerſing it, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. There is no denomination in the world who practiſes this baptiſm, but thoſe who are Baptiſts as to the adminiſtration of the ordinance: hence thoſe and thoſe only who baptize by immerſion, adminiſter the Chriſtian ordinance of baptiſm.

Wiſhing you more light, love, and knowledge than the writer poſſeſſes,

I remain yours, &c.

LETTER VI.

REVEREND SIR,

IT is manifeſtly a matter of importance with you, that the world ſhould conſider Paul, where he ſpeaks of baptiſm, Rom. vi. and Col. ii. 12. to intend the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt. It is, indeed, to your theory of baptiſm, a matter of the greateſt magnitude, to have theſe paſſages refer to the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt; for if they do not, they are as a great mill-ſtone, bound about the neck of all your arguments, and drown them all as in the ſea. So long as you can perſuade the prejudiced and inattentive to diſbelieve the plain import of the apoſtle's words and reaſon-

ings, ſo long you may prevent their feeling the force of theſe paſſages. But what will the world think of your reaſonings, and the blindneſs which they gather from them, provided it be here ſhown, as it indeed hath already been, that though we grant all your premiſes, the concluſion from them is fairly and undeniably this,—that immerſion is the only goſpel baptiſm. All your objection againſt allowing that the apoſtle, in Romans and Coloſſians, alludes to and intends water baptiſm, is conſidered to ariſe from an apprehenſion that immerſion would certainly follow. But we will attend to your premiſes.

In pages 33, 34, your words are, Water baptiſm is undoubtedly a ſymbol of the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt.

Pages 44, 45, you inform us that theſe paſſages, To be buried with Chriſt by baptiſm into death, to be buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, and to be raiſed with him in baptiſm, according to Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12. can never be proved to have any reſpect or even alluſion to external water baptiſm.

Again you tell us, page 60, "There muſt be ſome evident likeneſs, between the ſubject to which a word is applied in the natural and primitive uſe of it, and the ſubject to which it is applied as a figure, otherwiſe there is a groſs impropriety in the figurative uſe of it."

Hence, Sir, baptiſm is ſpoken of under the ſimilitude or figure of burying and riſing again. You reply, This is the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt. Grant it: yet you tell us, Water baptiſm is undoubtedly a ſymbol (i. e. an emblem or figure) of the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt. You may add, There is no likeneſs between the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, and burying and riſing again. But, Sir, you have declared to us, that "there muſt be ſome *evident likeneſs* between a ſubject to which a word is applied in the natural and primitive uſe of it, and the ſubject to which it is applied as a figure, otherwiſe there is a groſs impropriety in the figurative uſe of it."

Now, Sir, I ſee but two things between which you muſt chooſe; either, 1. That water baptiſm hath an evident likeneſs to a burial and reſurrection; or, 2. That the apoſtle was guilty of a groſs impropriety in the figurative uſe which he made of the words burying and the reſurrection. Take which you pleaſe.

You will pleaſe to review your aſſertion, page 47, "That the above texts in Romans and Coloſſians, do not even furniſh the ſhadow of proof for baptiſm by immerſion."

In the cloſe of your fifth Letter you ſet down theſe memorable words: "All your potent reaſoning here, in a few words, is this—The word *baptizō* means to immerſe, therefore the apoſtles, becauſe they were commanded to baptize, practiſed immerſion, and their practice of immerſion in baptizing proves that *baptizō* means to immerſe. Whether this be arguing in a circle, or arguing at all, I entreat you to *conſider*, take *advice*, and *ſpeak your mind.*"

Sir, I have *conſidered*, and find that you have given a partial ſtatement of my poor arguing, if I argued at all. I have taken advice of that part of my third Sermon which you are profeſſedly examining. Now, Sir, I will ſpeak my mind. It is, *firſt*, That your critical readers will doubt the correctneſs of your concluding aſſertion, (which is quoted above,) judging from the quotations which you have made from my Sermons, pages 36, 37, 38, 39. *Secondly*, My mind is, that an argument is good, though of a circular form, provided every part contains its own proper evidence. My mind is, *thirdly*, That it is a good rule, to put in the middle of our arguing thoſe particulars on which we place the leaſt dependence, and that in the beginning and cloſe of any and every arguing of weight, our particulars ſhould be able to ſuſtain the ſhock of our opponent's oppoſition. My mind is, *fourthly*, That you have told the world that all my *potent* reaſoning reſts upon thoſe particulars in which I never placed much confidence; whereas, were I to tell them where the ſtrength of the reaſoning lays, my information would be, that it lays, firſt, in the determinate meaning of the apoſtle's word, by which he expreſſes the thing done in the ordinance of baptiſm, without uſing the more common word *baptizō*, as Heb x. 22. 'Having our bodies (*leloumenoi*) waſhed with pure water, &c.' Laſtly, that the ſtrength of my reaſoning lay in the ſimilitudes which Paul uſes, when he would illuſtrate what is done to the perſons baptized, or what takes place in baptiſm; that the ſubjects are buried and raiſed again in baptiſm: this I conſidered ſufficient to make manifeſt the practice of the apoſtles. My mind is, *fifthly*, That the above reaſons may excuſe the circular appearance of my argumentation; or if they will not, theſe reaſons are ſufficient of themſelves to eſtabliſh what I wiſhed, aſide from the two middle particulars, which excited your obſervations. My mind is, *ſixthly*, That were your Letters, arguments, and their author uſed in a ſimilar manner, you would complain of unfairneſs. My mind is, *laſtly*, To leave it with our readers, to form what judgment they pleaſe upon the

concluſiveneſs or weakneſs of our arguments, and with reſpect to the truths which we advocate or oppoſe.

Your ſixth Letter comes next, that it may paſs in review: in which you bring forward what you term unequivocal and indiſputable evidence. If it be unequivocal and indiſputable, you need have no apprehenſions with relation to it, while it may paſs a candid review.

Page 52, ſay you, "It will not be denied that the word *niptō*, which is ſometimes uſed as equivalent with *baptizō*, generally means a partial waſhing. I have produced two or three examples, in which it is indiſputable that the word *louō* is uſed in the like partial ſenſe, and in not one is it clear that it is uſed to ſignify total immerſion. I will now add unequivocal evidence, to prove the direct contrary of your aſſertion, that the words *baptizō* and *baptiſmos* have not always the extenſive ſenſe of immerſion, but ſometimes, at leaſt, intend the application of water in a partial manner."

I. "In Luke xi. 38. it is too plain to admit of any controverſy, that *baptizō* is uſed in a ſenſe different from that of a total immerſion in water of the ſubject to which it is applied:—'And when the Phariſee ſaw it, he marvelled that he had not firſt waſhed before dinner."

Anſ. Sir, your not knowing the traditionary laws of the Phariſees, and your inattention to the connexion and plain import of this paſſage in Luke, and in that of Mark vii. is the only excuſe which can be made for you, whilſt you very incautiouſly, and with great boldneſs, moſt roundly contradict the plain word of the Lord, in what you ſay on theſe paſſages, from page 52 to 57.

The laws traditionary among the Phariſees were, among others, theſe two: 1. "They eat not bread, or any common meal, at any common time, except they waſh their hands;" 2. "When they come from the *market*, or from a crowded aſſembly of clean and unclean perſons, they baptize themſelves, or were baptized;" that is, they immerſed or bathed themſelves all over in water. This ſecond law carries its own traditionary evidence with it, ſo that it is at once obvious, upon our underſtanding the reaſon of the firſt. The reaſon of the firſt, or of their waſhing their hands, was, leſt they had touched ſome unclean thing, and ſo their hands might have contracted ſome defilement. Now, the reaſon of their immerſing or baptizing themſelves, when they came from the *market*, or from the midſt of a *promiſcuous multitude*, is manifeſt; for in ſuch places, and in ſuch company, they could not tell on what part their defilement might be; they

muſt, therefore, ceremonially cleanſe themſelves, or be ceremonially cleanſed, all over: they muſt make the outſide clean, according to their traditionary law.

This, Sir, exactly agrees with what is related of this matter by both Mark and Luke.

As you have firſt taken the paſſage in Luke, ſo I will mention the circumſtances of that firſt. The paſſage is, 'When the Phariſee ſaw it, he marvelled that he had not firſt waſhed (or was not firſt immerſed) before dinner.' The noticeable circumſtances are two: 1. Jeſus had come from a promiſcuous aſſembly, where the people were *gathered thick together*, verſe 29. 2. The reproof which our Lord gave the Phariſees, 'Now do ye Phariſees make *clean* the *outſide* of the *cup* and *platter*,' *plainly* referring to the traditionary waſhing, immerſing, or baptizing their bodies, when they had been *publickly* expoſed to contract, as they ſuppoſed, ſome outward defilement.

As to the paſſage in Mark vii. the matter appears, if poſſible, ſtill more explicit. In the ſecond verſe, the Phariſees found fault, becauſe Chriſt's diſciples ate bread with unwaſhen hands: in the third, we are told that the Phariſees ate not, unleſs they waſhed their hands with exactneſs, or rubbing them: and in the fourth verſe, we have an account of their carrying their ſuperſtition ſtill farther; for when they came from the *market*, they ate not except they baptized themſelves, or waſhed, or bathed all over. This, Sir, makes the Scripture all eaſy and natural. But this plain, fair, and natural expoſition of Scripture very illy ſuits you unſcriptural and unchriſtian, or antichriſtian, practice of *rantizing* for *baptizing*, or ſprinkling, or partial waſhing, for the goſpel ordinance of immerſion.

You produce not one text of Scripture to prove your aſſertions, or any other authority, ſave Grotius, "who (you ſay) is the moſt reſpectable writer that ever appeared on our ſide of the queſtion;" and he admits your expoſition; but, Sir, I do not, nor does the word of God admit it. Nor have you, nor can you find ſo much as a ſingle paſſage in the word of God, where *baptizō* and *niptō* are uſed, but the attending circumſtances will ſhow that they mean different things, or a different application of the ſame thing.

In page 55, ſpeaking of Luke xi. 38. you ſay, "This paſſage has been often mentioned by Pædobaptiſt writers, but ſomehow the proper light in which it preſents itſelf is ſtrangely overlooked by you and your brethren." The proper

light, Sir, we conſider to be Scripture light; this we believe God hath ſhown us: by this light we diſcover your miſapplication of the paſſage. You ſubjoin, "That Mr. Cleaveland made uſe of it, we have your authority, under the following quotation from him,—"Your learned men know that the word *baptizō*, Luke xi. 38. and *baptiſmos*, Mark vii. 5. are uſed to ſignify the ſame as *niptō* is; that is, proper waſhing, or making clean by the application of water, in caſes that do not neceſſarily require dipping, as the mode of waſhing." You anſwer by flatly contradicting the good man's aſſertion: nay, you go farther, and ſay, that the learned men, in no other claſs, know any ſuch thing." You, Sir, are pleaſed to add, "They certainly do know it, as far as the Bible furniſhes them with information." *Reply.* True, but the Bible furniſhes them with no ſuch information. You ſtill ſubjoin, "I am ſorry, my dear Sir, that you have not given us a better ſpecimen of your modeſty." Falſe modeſty aſide, Sir, when you or your brethren would, by wreſting the Scriptures, force from us and from the world the precious ordinance of baptiſm, and even the knowledge of it.

We now proceed to what you ſet down as undeniable evidence. Your words are, page 57, "Another caſe in which the word *baptizō* is undeniably uſed to convey an idea entirely different from that of complete immerſion, occurs 1 Cor. x. 2. 'And were all baptized (*ebaptiſanto*) unto Moſes in the cloud and in the ſea."

Here let Paul explain himſelf, or let the preceding verſe explain what this means. The preceding verſe is, 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye ſhould be *ignorant*, how that all our fathers were *under* the cloud, and all paſſed *through* the ſea:' then follows, verſe 2, 'And were all baptized unto Moſes IN the cloud and IN the ſea.' How does this "undeniably convey an idea entirely different from that of complete immerſion?" It looks to me ſomewhat like the ſame idea. It certainly has the appearance of being overwhelmed, or completely encompaſſed. They were all *under* the cloud, they all paſſed *through* the ſea; they were baptized IN the cloud and IN the ſea. This your undeniable evidence againſt the idea of immerſion, appears, upon the very face of it, to favour, ſtrongly to favour, the very truth which you brought it to deſtroy. Thus, Sir, your unequivocal evidence, and your undeniable evidence, and all your evidence, which you bring againſt immerſion, as the only goſpel baptiſm, turn out like Balaam, whom Balak hired to curſe Iſrael,—*they bleſs it altogether.*

The next witneſs which you produce will not be particularly noticed, for you confeſs, ſaying, "I do not contend that it is concluſive." But, ſay you, "The paſſage in Heb. ix. 10. it appears to me, is concluſive." It ſhall, then, be ſpecially noticed. "It determines (ſay you) that *baptizō*, and *baptiſmos* its derivative to be generic terms, comprehending ſeveral ways of applying water, without ſpecifically deſignating either—'Which ſtood only in meats, and drinks, and divers waſhings, (*diaphorois baptiſmois*) &c.' Theſe baptiſms were undoubtedly all thoſe applications of fluids which were preſcribed in the Moſaic law."

Had you read your text three words further, and taken ſuitable notice of them, they would have ſpoiled your concluſion. You will permit me to read the text, with the three additional words: it is thus,—'Which ſtood only in meats, and drinks, and divers waſhings, and *carnal ordinances*.' Now, Sir, the concluſion is, "Theſe baptiſms were undoubtedly not all thoſe applications of fluids which were preſcribed in the Moſaic law; for carnal ordinances compriſe the ordinances of God concerning bloody ſacrifices. Theſe ordinances compriſe the ſprinkling of blood, and the aſhes of an heifer, &c. Hence, Sir, your concluſion is defective, and ſo ſpoiled.

Our next inquiry ſhall be, What are the waſhings in the ceremonial law? Then we ſhall inquire whether theſe waſhings, compared with the text, do not ſpoil your concluſion from it? Your concluſion is, That divers waſhings include ſprinkling, as the ſprinkling of blood, and the aſhes of an heifer, &c.

The ceremonial waſhings, mentioned in the law, appear to be at moſt but of ſeven kinds, and ſome of theſe have but ſlight ſhades of difference. Theſe kinds are, as I ſhall mention them,—

1. 'It ſhall be rinſed *in* water,' Lev. vi. 28. This obviouſly implies immerſion.

2. 'Aaron and his ſons ſhall waſh their feet at the laver,' Exod. xxx. 18, 19. This might be performed by immerſing their hands and their feet, and it might not.

3. 'It ſhall be *ſcoured in* water,' Lev. vi. 28. This ſuppoſes immerſion.

4. 'He ſhall waſh his clothes *in* water,' Lev. xiv. 9. This implies immerſion.

5. 'He ſhall bathe himſelf *in water*, he ſhall waſh all his fleſh in water,' Lev. xv. 11, 16. This taken literally is immerſion.

6. 'Aaron and his ſons thou (Moſes) ſhalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and ſhalt waſh them with water,' Exod. xxix. 4. This means, according to the probability, not immerſion.

7. 'It muſt be put into water,' Lev. xi. 32. This is manifeſtly immerſion.

We ſhall now inquire whether theſe waſhings, compared with the text, which ſaith divers waſhings, do not ſpoil your concluſion. Your concluſion is, that divers waſhings include ſprinklings, all kinds of the ſprinklings of fluids, as the ſprinklings of blood, and of the aſhes of an heifer, &c.

Here it is worthy of note, that in no place is waſhing called ſprinkling, or ſprinkling called waſhing. Is your concluſion ſpoiled? It is likewiſe worthy of your particular obſervation, that in the Moſaic law there are ſeveral ſpecies of ceremonial waſhings, which evidently imply immerſion; ſuch as rinſing, ſcouring in water, putting into water, and the like. Now, Sir, how do you know that Paul, or the Holy Ghoſt by him, included in (*diaphoroîs baptiſmois*) divers waſhings, any other kind of waſhing but thoſe kinds which imply immerſion? There appears no intimation, from the words uſed, from the connexion, or from common ſenſe, that any waſhing which does not imply immerſion was meant. If you do not know that any other kind of waſhing is intended, then you do not yet know but my ſentiment as to the ſignification of *baptizō* is correct in every part, completely ſo.

But as this text is your laſt reſort, I will juſt obſerve to you and the public, that even were your ideas of the text, and your concluſion too, as to its including ſprinkling, all admitted, and fully granted, it would not put my general principle, that baptiſm by immerſion is the only goſpel baptiſm, to any danger; for were there a thouſand ſpecies or kinds of baptiſm, there is, however, but one which is a goſpel ordinance, as Paul aſſures us in his epiſtle to the Epheſians; and this *one* kind of *baptiſm* is the kind which, as Paul tells us in Romans and Coloſſians, and as you by conſequence confeſs, has an evident likeneſs to burying and riſing again. Baptiſm by immerſion is the only baptiſm which hath this evident likeneſs. Hence, Sir, whether you will be judge yourſelf, or leave it with Paul, it comes, when we put matters together, to the ſame thing. Baptiſm by immerſion is the only goſpel baptiſm: hence, Sir, your ſprinkling for baptiſm, or your partial waſhing for baptiſm, or your waſhing with rubbing for baptiſm, all turn out unſcriptural and of man's invention.

Your poſition, Sir, is indeed a trying one to a benevolent mind. You believe ſprinkling or partial waſhing to be baptiſm. You have laboured much to prove that there are more baptiſms than one, hoping in this way to eſtabliſh ſprinkling for baptiſm, as a neceſſary conſequence. Whereas, could you prove what you have not, and what we believe you never can, that there are baptiſms which do not imply immerſion, overwhelming, or the like, ſtill it would afford no more evidence, that ſprinkling or any partial waſhing is goſpel baptiſm, than it proves that Moſes' ſprinkling the blood of ſlain beaſts upon the people, or aſhes into the air, is goſpel baptiſm; for Chriſtians have but *one goſpel baptiſm*, Eph. iv. 5. and if you have more, they belong to another goſpel, and are of Antichriſt's invention.

I am yours, &c.

LETTER VII.

REVEREND SIR,

IN the beginning of your ſeventh Letter, "you requeſt me to conſider what concluſion we are naturally to draw from thoſe places in which the word *baptizō* is uſed figuratively." This I have already done in a preceding Letter, and the concluſion which we found to flow naturally from it, was immerſion; for you informed us, that Paul ſpake of this baptiſm, or deſcribed it by the figurative language, burying, planting, and riſing. You alſo in this place inform us, "that there muſt be ſome evident likeneſs between the ſubject to which a word is applied in the natural primitive uſe of it, and the ſubject to which it is applied as a figure; otherwiſe there is a groſs impropriety in the figurative uſe of it." The concluſion is hence perfectly natural, that when *baptizō* is uſed figuratively, it means a figurative immerſion, that is, a figurative burying and reſurrection, or immerſion in ſome element or thing, aſide from water.

I might have added no more here, on the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, did I conſider your obſervations ſufficiently explicit and accurate: but as the matter is, more muſt be ſaid.

Whilſt ſpeaking of the pouring out of the Spirit, as mentioned by the prophet Joel, ii. 28. you expreſs your ſenti-

ment in the following manner: "This prophecy the apoſtle Peter expreſsly applies to the affuſion of the Spirit on the diſciples, on the memorable day of Pentecoſt, when they were filled with, not plunged in, the Holy Ghoſt, and began to ſpeak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. According to your ſtrange treatment of this paſſage, which ſurely is (ſay you to me) more like rant than reaſoning, the ſound and the Spirit were the ſame thing, and the apoſtles were overwhelmed with, or immerſed in, ſound."

Anſ. I ſaid not that the apoſtles were plunged, overwhelmed, or immerſed in ſound: I ſaid this,—that the houſe was filled with the ſound, wind, or Spirit from heaven, and that the apoſtles were overwhelmed, for all the houſe where they were ſitting was filled. I left it with you to determine with what the houſe was filled, whether with ſound, wind, or Spirit: but as you have determined not according to my liking, that it was filled with ſound, I muſt ſtill add, and will do it as explicitly as I can.

The operation wrought on the morning of the memorable day of Pentecoſt, let it be what it may, was the baptizing of the diſciples with the Holy Ghoſt, as Chriſt promiſed, Acts i. 5.

Queſt. What was now done?

Anſ. Three things were done.

1. There was a ſound from heaven as of a mighty ruſhing wind, (this is what attended the pouring out of the Spirit from heaven,) and it filled all the houſe where they were ſitting. What filled all the houſe? You may reply, Sound filled all the houſe; but is your reply warranted from the text, and circumſtances attending? Is it not much more conſiſtent with truth, and with the intent of the text, to ſay that all the houſe was filled with the remarkable preſence and power of the Holy Ghoſt? To me, the latter is the important and juſt ſenſe of the text.

2. Another thing done was, there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it ſat upon each of them.

3. They were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt.

Now, Sir, you will judge, or let common ſenſe judge, what part, or whether every part of this operation comes in to make up what is called the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt. To me, it is a plain caſe that the diſciples were encompaſſed or overwhelmed with the divine glory, or with the remarkable preſence of the Holy Ghoſt, as well as filled with it; and that this was the baptiſm which was predicted and accompliſhed.

As to the text, 1 Cor. xii. 13. 'For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,' the import appears, from the connexion, to be this,—all Chriſtians, though of very different gifts and graces, are all bound and incloſed by one Spirit, in one myſtical body.

Your collateral arguments muſt now paſs a ſhort review.

Neither you nor my readers would be troubled with any attention to theſe, but I wiſh to meet and remove every thing which preſents even a plauſible difficulty in my way.

After having exhauſted your arguments, which poſſeſs any apparent or ſuppoſed formidableneſs, you obſerve, page 62, "Other collateral arguments againſt the juſtneſs of your propoſition readily occur."

I. "There being not a word ſaid, in any caſe of baptiſm, about the perſons changing their apparel, and going to a bath or river, for the expreſs and evident purpoſe of being *immerſed*."

Anſ. Did you never read, Mat. iii. 13. 'Then cometh Jeſus *from Galilee to Jordan* unto John, (for what?) to be baptized of him.' The plain, literal, and common import of this is, as we have ſhown from your Letters, as well as from the Scriptures, Jeſus came from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be immerſed of him.

As for change of apparel, it might be with them, in John's day, and in the days of the apoſtles, as it has been with ſeveral in this place. When they came from home they thought not of being baptized, but when they *gladly received* the word, love conſtrained them to obey their Lord; and there was no change of garments in the caſe, ſave they threw aſide ſome of their looſer garments, and having received the ordinance, put them on again.

II. "The improbability (ſay you) that the water which was made uſe of for baptizing the eunuch, as it was a water to which they happened to be near, and was not ſought for the purpoſe, ſhould be in ſufficient quantity for his immerſion."

Anſ. Philip had told the eunuch what the ordinance of baptiſm meant, or he would not have wiſhed that he might be the ſubject of it. If he knew what it meant, he would probably know whether they ſaw a ſufficiency of water.

III. Your next collateral argument is, "The difficulty of ſuppoſing the three thouſand, mentioned Acts ii. 41. to have been immerſed in that part of one day which followed their converſion, eſpecially conſidering the probable want

of bathing places, and their not having at command ſuitable change of apparel."

Anſ. 1. At Jeruſalem lived at this time probably not leſs than three hundred thouſand, one-third of theſe at leaſt were obliged to bathe themſelves frequently, on account of ſome ceremonial uncleanneſs, and many of the others often; hence there was no want of bathing places.

Anſ. 2. There was no want of qualified adminiſtrators; for their number appears to have been about an hundred and twenty; compare Acts i. 15. with ii. 2, 3, 4.; theſe could have baptized the whole in leſs than an hour.

Anſ. 3. As to their probably not having at command ſuitable change of apparel, this would be thought of little conſequence by them, or by any others, who felt the ſolemnity, the importance, and the ſpirit of the precious ordinance of goſpel baptiſm. Hence, Sir, here is no difficulty, but to ſuch as have no heart to follow the example of the Lamb of God.

IV. "The form of expreſſion (ſay you) which Peter uſes, Acts x. 47. 'Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized?' and the fact of their being baptized by the command of Peter immediately, and as it would ſeem on the ſpot. This queſtion of Peter, and this fact in the narrative, viewed conjunctly, have not the appearance of going to a water, for the purpoſe of immerſing Cornelius, his kinſmen and friends who were with him, but of baptizing him by the application of water produced in ſome veſſel."

Anſ. Sir, had we need of any more arguments for immerſion, this account of Cornelius would manifeſtly come to our help, and the following particulars will ſhow it.

1. Cornelius was a Roman captain guarding Judea, which was at this time one of the provinces conquered by the Romans.

2. Cornelius being a Roman officer in a foreign country, probably poſſeſſed no land but that on which his houſe and the barracks for his ſoldiers ſtood.

3. Cornelius being a Roman, not a Jew, he would probably not furniſh himſelf with a bath or bathing place.

4. All who know the jealouſy of the Jews as to their liberties, and what animoſity they have generally borne towards their conquerors, may ſee at once they would not be very ready to grant favours to a Gentile officer, whoſe office and preſence put them in conſtant remembrance of their ſubjection.

5. The Jews probably owned all the bathing places which were for miles round, and Cornelius had no liberty to occupy them without their conſent.

Under theſe circumſtances, we may conclude, and very rationally too, that Peter would addreſs the Jews who came from Joppa with him, and others who might poſſibly be preſent, and ſay to them, with relation to his brethren, who were owners of the bathing places round about Cornelius's habitation, Who of us Jews, who believe in God and in his Son Jeſus, can be ſo tenacious of our civil privileges, and bear ſo much ill will to the Romans, as to forbid water, or the uſe of ſome bathing place, that theſe ſinners of the Gentiles, who have now received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we, ſhould not be permitted to receive the goſpel ordinance of baptiſm? This appears all eaſy and natural: but to ſuppoſe that Peter meant, Can any man forbid a baſon of water to be brought in, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, would be totally and manifeſtly unnatural, and inconſiſtent with the attending circumſtances. Peter was now in Cornelius's houſe: Cornelius had both ſervants and ſoldiers at a moment's command, and it would perhaps have been the laſt thing that any one of the company would have thought of, to have forbidden a bowl of water to be brought by one of the ſervants, at the command of Cornelius. You, Sir, and the reader will judge which ſide, yours or the Baptiſt's, is favoured by this collateral argument of yours.

V. Say you, "The ſtrong probability, notwithſtanding your ſuppoſitions, that the jailer and his houſe were not baptized by immerſion."

For anſwer, the reader is referred to my ſixth Sermon, pages 93, 94, firſt edition; however, I will reply to a queſtion which you put under this argument. "If here was immerſion, (ſay you) why do we not hear ſomething about a *river* or bathing place, going out to it, returning, &c.? *Anſ.* We do hear or read in the ſame chapter, and with reſpect to the ſame city where the jailer lived, that there was a *river* running through the city, or by it. It was by the ſide of this, where Paul and Silas ſpake unto the women, where prayer was wont to be made. We alſo read of the jailer and the apoſtles coming in, of conſequence they muſt have gone out.

VI. Say you, page 65, "I will juſt ſubjoin, for I conſult brevity as much as poſſible, the caſe of Paul, Acts ix. 18, 19. 'And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been ſcales; and he received ſight forthwith, and aroſe, and was baptized."

Anſ. Why, Sir, did you not mention Acts xxii. 16. where the ſame hiſtory of Paul is related in the following words—'Ariſe, and be baptized, and *waſh away* thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord'? The reaſon is ſufficiently plain: in this relation of the ſame tranſaction, the manner in which water was to be applied to Paul, in the ordinance of baptiſm, was mentioned by implication. He was to be bathed or immerſed in water, and thus, by a figure, he was to waſh away his ſins, or to have them apparently or figuratively waſhed away.

Having ſaid what you pleaſed, and probably every thing which you thought plauſible, at leaſt the things which you judged moſt ſo, then you obſerve, as a kind of concluſion, thus,—"I ſuggeſt theſe things curſorily, not pretending that they furniſh demonſtration, that the uniform import of the term baptize, as uſed in the Scriptures, is a partial waſhing ſhort of immerſion; for that is not a point I am aiming to eſtabliſh, but as furniſhing *direct proof* againſt your hypotheſis, that the word ſignifies to immerſe, and that only. If there are exceptions, and we ſee that there is abundant evidence that there are, your main propoſition relative to baptiſm falls, and with it muſt fall, for this reaſon, as well as for the other previouſly given, your whole ſuperſtructure of cloſe communion."

Anſ. I have, Sir, two objections againſt this your concluſion. One is, You tell us about *direct proof* againſt my hypotheſis, when not one paſſage which you have brought, nor all of them put together, where *baptizō* is uſed, furniſh, ſtrictly ſpeaking, ſo much as one plauſible argument againſt my hypotheſis. When you take the derivative of *baptizō* there is ſomething plauſible, but it furniſhes no proof, direct or indirect, againſt it. The moſt which you can ſay with ſafety is, that when the apoſtle ſpeaks of *diaphoreis baptiſmois*, divers waſhings, he might mean, or you believe he meant to include more kinds of waſhings than the multitude of rinſings, ſcourings in water, and puttings into water, &c. which were enjoined in the ceremonial law. You have no proof, or at leaſt you have given us none, that he intended any other kinds of waſhings, which did not imply immerſion. Even if you could do what you have not done, produce proof that *baptiſmois* did include ſome kinds of waſhings which were not entire immerſion, ſtill this would be no direct proof that *baptizō* was ever uſed to import any thing ſhort of entire immerſion. Your proof, therefore, fails you utterly; hence my hypotheſis as yet ſtands ſecurely.

My other objection is, You tell us that there is abundance of evidence that there are exceptions, i. e. that *baptizo* does not always mean immerſion, or the like. We have received all your Letters, and find *no evidence*. You have produced ſeveral pretended witneſſes, but they agree not together, nor does any one of them ſpeak to the point in hand; and even when we ſummed up your own evidence, it was, that immerſion was the only goſpel baptiſm which you could find; hence my main propoſition ſtands, and with it *muſt ſtand* my *whole ſuperſtructure* of cloſe communion.

In page 66, you mention the appeals which have been made on both ſides, to the learned fathers and critics; and then, in page 67, make this excellent declaration and appeal, "We refuſe, Sir, (ſay you) to be bound by human teſtimony, in an eſſential article of Chriſtian practice: we appeal to the *oracles* of *truth*." This is juſt the reſolution and point to which the Baptiſts wiſh to bring your denomination. If you might be inſtrumental of purſuading them to refuſe human teſtimony, as the baſis of any eſſential article in the Chriſtian faith, and to take the oracles of truth, as being a ſufficient guide in matters of faith and practice, and to believe that the man of God, ſo far as he underſtands them, is perfect, throughly furniſhed unto all good works, you would do an eſſential ſervice to the cauſe of truth, and your praiſe would be in all the churches. Could this be effected, we might hope for a ſpeedy union between the two denominations. Could we all agree to walk by one rule, we might expect to be ſoon in one path.

The next thing which in your Letters appears worthy of particular attention, is your ſolemn addreſs to me, in page 70, a part of which is in the words following,—"I entreat you to come to a ſolemn pauſe, and with your eye upon the judgment day, inquire whether you have authority to exclude all Pædobaptiſts from a viſible ſtanding in Chriſt's kingdom, and from the communion of ſaints in an ordinance which was given to them as a moſt valuable bequeſt of their Redeemer, merely becauſe they have not been baptized in the manner of immerſion?"

My reply to you, Sir, is,

1. It was a ſolemn belief in a judgment to come, and that the light of that day would detect all error, and diſcover the truth, and bring me to acknowledge it, which greatly ſubdued the riſings of my carnal heart againſt the cloſe communion Baptiſts. After I had thought much of the particular ſentiments of the Baptiſts, and had had no ſmall diffi-

culty as to my own practice, their cloſe communion ſcheme, as I then conſidered it, appeared to me ſo erroneous, that I was upon the point of concluding them to be wrong throughout, and of ſettling down upon my old practice; but, Sir, a ſolemn belief in a judgment to come, calmed my oppoſition; and a ſolemn belief that truth would then appear, and that if the Baptiſts were in the truth, they would then appear ſo, prevailed upon me to give their diſtinguiſhing ſentiments one ſolemn hearing more. I may ſay, it was the judgment day as a mean, which made me a Baptiſt. I have daily a ſolemn view, or ſolemn thoughts, on death, judgment, and eternity; and with reference to theſe, I ſometimes deſire to do with my might what my hands find to do, for God and the church.

2. My reply is, that I have no authority to exclude you from any place where Chriſt hath put you, nor from any ordinance which he hath bequeathed to you: but I have no belief of ſprinkling, nor of any thing elſe ſhort of immerſion, being goſpel baptiſm. I have no belief of a perſon's belonging to Chriſt's viſible kingdom, before he is baptized. I have no belief of Chriſt's having bequeathed the ordinance of the ſupper to any, till they belong to his viſible kingdom; conſequently, I have no belief of your having any goſpel right to partake of that ordinance; hence, my ſettled belief is, that I have no liberty to encourage you to come, till you repent of your perverſion of the firſt goſpel ordinance, and be baptized.

Say you again, conſider, "I beſeech you, how your doctrine belittles the glorious and growing kingdom of the Meſſiah, &c.; how it obliges you to go abreaſt of the moſt affecting facts, I mean the wonderful ſucceſs which has attended the labours of thouſands of Pædobaptiſt miniſters"

But, my dear Sir, you have forgotten the appeal which you have but juſt made to the oracles of truth. On the laſt page this appeal was made, and now you are appealing to good Pædobaptiſt miniſters, to convict me of an error. I ſhall no more conſent to ſuch an appeal. To the oracles of truth thou haſt appealed, and to them thou muſt go, and by them thou and thy works muſt be judged. By them convict either me or my doctrines, and I am ſilent. But at no other tribunal do I for the preſent conſent to meet you, or to be tried myſelf.

Wiſhing that we may both of us be prepared to meet the God of truth, in Him who is the *truth*,

I am, &c.

LETTER VIII.

REVEREND SIR,

I NOW haſten to a review of your examination of my Sermon on the ſubjects of baptiſm.

In page 72, you complain of my ſtatement of the queſtion, which relates to the command to diſciple all nations. I ſtated it thus: The important queſtion to be decided is juſt this—*If I diſciple any of you who are parents, do I, as a neceſſary conſequence, diſciple all your children and houſeholds?*

You object—"No, Sir, this is not juſt the queſtion; the queſtion reſpects the object of this act of diſcipling. Whom are you to *diſciple?* the text ſays, All nations." Very well; and do not nations conſiſt of parents, with their children and houſeholds? In the next page you ſay, "The capability of the objects muſt certainly be ſuppoſed; but there can be no capability in the infant part of a nation, but by virtue of their relation to their parents." Very well again; this comes to juſt what I ſaid—If your ſcheme be juſt, we diſciple the children by diſcipling the parents.

Before we proceed any further, we will give our Saviour's definition of a diſciple, Luke xiv. 33. 'Whoſoever he be of you that forſaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my diſciple.' Now, Sir, the important queſtion is juſt this—If through my inſtrumentality a parent forſakes all that he hath, and ſo becomes a diſciple, do the infant children and houſehold become diſciples of courſe? This is your ſcheme, Sir, but it is not mine nor the goſpel's.

In connexion, you aſk, "Is it impoſſible for God to perfect praiſe from the mouth of babes and ſucklings, and that of ſuch, in part, his kingdom of *grace* ſhould conſiſt?" From what motive you aſked this queſtion, which, from its connexion, tends to deceive the inattentive, I know not, but to it I reply—You have changed the ſubject in debate; we are not ſpeaking of the kingdom of *grace*, but of Chriſt's viſible kingdom: beſides, the babes and ſucklings which are ſpoken of in the goſpel, and of which Chriſt's viſible kingdom does no doubt in part conſiſt, are ſuch as cried in the temple, ſaying, Hoſanna to the Son of David.

You complain again, becauſe I ſubſtituted *diſciple* for *teach*, and ſo make the command of our Lord to be, Go and diſciple all nations; yet in the next page you ſay, "The ſubſtitution of the term diſciple, is much more favourable to

the cauſe of the Pædobaptiſts than to yours." Why ſo? Becauſe, as you implicitly tell us in the preceding ſentence, and imply in this, that children cannot be taught by virtue of their relation to their parents, but that they may be diſciples by virtue of this relation. But, Sir, you quite forget your appeal to the oracles of truth, or determine not to abide their deciſion, or you could never ſuppoſe that an infant, or that a child of any age, could, by virtue of his relation to his parents, forſake all that he hath, and ſo become a diſciple of Chriſt. "But (in the cloſe you ſay) allow, in this reſpect alſo, all that you wiſh, that the command extends to adults only, what will follow? Will it follow that this paſſage interdicts infant baptiſm? By no means," ſay you. I anſwer, By all means, it does interdict all others; for the text, Mat. xxviii. 19. is the general orders, and it is the particular orders, which Jeſus Chriſt hath given, relative to the ſubjects of baptiſm, and he hath given us no different orders. When he hath pointed out, and particularly deſignated, who are to be admitted to his ordinance of baptiſm, he interdicts all others, and none elſe have a right to come; nor have his miniſters any authority to baptize any others; and it is groſs preſumption, if they knowingly adminiſter to perſons of a different deſcription.

You next examine three ſhort arguments of mine, againſt infant baptiſm.

1. John made his hearers diſciples, before he baptized them.

2. Chriſt's diſciples baptized none, but ſuch as were made diſciples firſt, according to John iv. 1, 2.

3. Chriſt, in my text, gives no liberty to baptize any, but ſuch as are firſt diſcipled.

You aſſent to each of theſe arguments, as being well founded; nay, if poſſible, you do more: you inform us that the caſe of infant baptiſm was not mentioned by John, by Jeſus Chriſt, or by his diſciples. Your words are, "There was good reaſon why, when baptiſm was introduced, as adminiſtered to the Jews, the caſe of infants was not mentioned: it is doubtful whether they were baptized; I am inclined to think they were not." Now, Sir, if there were good reaſon why, when baptiſm was introduced, as adminiſtered to the Jews, the caſe of infants was not mentioned, then it was not; if it were not mentioned then, among the Jews, it was not mentioned at all by Jeſus Chriſt, for he was no where elſe. If it were not mentioned by Chriſt, it is not in the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt; for none

had authority to add any thing but what he had commanded. This being the caſe, ſurely you have not expreſſed yourſelf too ſtrongly, where you ſay, "It is doubtful whether they (infants) were baptized; I am inclined to think they were not." But if this be the truth, that neither John, nor Jeſus Chriſt, the Chriſtian Lawgiver, nor his diſciples, ſo much as mentioned infant baptiſm, I wiſh to know by what authority you and your brethren practiſe it? and who gave you this authority? From Chriſt you received it not; for you confeſs that he mentioned it not in his days, or you ſay, "there was good reaſon why the caſe of infants was not then mentioned." You alſo confeſs, his diſciples did not mention it in the days of Chriſt, nor for I know not how long afterwards. The apoſtles have, indeed, no where ſaid a word of infant baptiſm. By what authority then do you teach infant baptiſm, and preſume to practiſe it? and who gave you this authority? Have you any authority, ſave from the *popes* of Rome, from the mother of harlots, the myſtery of iniquity, compriſing the kings of the earth, who are at war with the Lamb?

Wiſhing you wiſdom and grace enough to renounce the traditions of popes and councils, and to practiſe by goſpel rules,

I am, &c.

LETTER IX.

REVEREND SIR,

YOUR Letter upon the covenant of circumciſion, demands our next attention. You manifeſt a very ſtrong attachment to this covenant: you conſider it to be the inſurmountable obſtacle in our way, and the hinge on which hangs the controverſy between us; yes, you ſet it down to be the rock on which are all our hopes. You tell us, "if we do not keep it, we are *inevitably loſt* forever."

It might be thought by ſome to be a ſufficient anſwer, to aſk, What then hath become of Enoch, Methuſelah, Noah, and many others, who lived and died long before the covenant of circumciſion had exiſtence? But, Sir, as your mind is highly intent on this covenant, and as I indeed conſider it an important article, I will ſet it before you with as much perſpicuity as I can.

To clear the way to introduce the covenant of circumciſion, I will juſt mention the covenant which includes the promiſes which were made to Abraham and to his ſeed; 'not to ſeeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy ſeed, which is Chriſt,' Gal. iii. 16. This covenant was before time; but it was confirmed of God in Chriſt, (to Abraham) twenty years before the covenant of circumciſion was made or mentioned, verſe 17. This covenant, which included the promiſes of grace, was mentioned or intimated, Gen. xii. 3. The ſame covenant, or ſome of the promiſes contained in it, or flowing from it, are again mentioned, Gen. xii. 7. xv. 8. and xvii. 1—8. and in many other places. With regard to this covenant, there is no profeſſed difficulty between your denomination and the Baptiſts, ſave in one point, whether this covenant and that of circumciſion be the ſame.

You believe this covenant contains all the promiſes of grace, and that this covenant and that of circumciſion are one and the ſame covenant.

We believe this covenant contains Chriſt, and as all the promiſes of grace are in Chriſt, ſo all the promiſes are contained in this covenant; and that the covenant of circumciſion is a covenant diſtinct from this, and is but a token of this. We believe the firſt covenant, which, for the ſake of diſtinction, is called the covenant of grace, compriſes this covenant of circumciſion, ſo far as circumciſion was of grace; but we do not believe that the covenant of grace was the covenant of circumciſion; we believe the latter covenant to be a *token* of the former, and yet ſo diſtinct from it as to be two diſtinct covenants. Our inquiry ſhall be, Do not the Scriptures ſay the ſame things?

Before I make the propoſed inquiry I have a few things to obſerve.

1. The covenant of grace is what God agrees, if I may ſo ſay, or covenants, or promiſes to do for Abraham, his poſterity, and for the family of mankind; or that which God hath promiſed to do for the human family, is the viſible part of the covenant of grace, as it reſpects the good of man.

2. The covenant of circumciſion is what God required Abraham to agree to and to practiſe.

3. The firſt covenant was repeatedly mentioned, and was confirmed by the promiſe of God, before the ſecond was once brought to view.

4. The covenant of circumciſion appears to be no more the covenant of grace, in which are the promiſes, than my

believing in and approving of the mediatorial righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, is that all-ſufficient righteouſneſs. God required Abraham and his natural ſeed to obſerve the covenant of circumciſion; he requires me and all others to believe. The ſoul who was not circumciſed, had broken the covenant; ſo the unbeliever is condemned already, Gen. xvii. 14. John iii. 18.

5. By confounding theſe two covenants together, you confound yourſelf, and confuſe your readers and hearers, and obtain ſome unreaſonable plauſibility in favour of your unſcriptural notions of baptizing children.

6. If theſe covenants were one, ſtill they neither of them ſay a word about the baptiſm of children, or of Chriſtian baptiſm for any perſon; nor are they ever mentioned by Chriſt, by his diſciples, or by any others, as giving any right to baptiſm, unleſs it were by the Phariſees and Sadducees who came to John's baptiſm.

7. The covenant of circumciſion is but a token of the covenant between God and Abraham; or a token of God's promiſes being to Abraham for good, and a ſeal of Abraham's faithfulneſs.

Now our inquiry ſhall be—Say not the Scriptures the ſame things?

In the firſt place, the Scriptures tell us, that God promiſed to Abraham, that in his ſeed all the families of the earth ſhould be bleſſed, Gen. xii. 3. The Scriptures alſo aſſure us, that God promiſed to Abraham, that his ſeed ſhould inherit the land of Canaan, and that God would make him the father of many nations, Gen. xii. 7. xv. 18. xvii. 1—8. Theſe are promiſes contained in the covenant of grace, or theſe are the covenant of grace, as manifeſted to Abraham; or they are promiſes founded upon, or flowing from, that covenant.

In the next place, the Scriptures ſay, Gen. xvii. 10, 11. '*This is my covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee; Every man-child among you ſhall be circumciſed. And ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreſkin; and it ſhall be a* TOKEN *of the covenant betwixt me and you.*' Hence, if you can underſtand two plain verſes in the Bible, you may underſtand what the covenant of circumciſion is. In theſe two verſes we have the ſame thing mentioned four times, in different words: firſt, God ſays, *This* is my covenant; ſecondly, he tells what it is, *Every man-child* among you ſhall be *circumciſed*; thirdly, God informs us how this *covenant* is

to be kept, Ye ſhall *circumciſe* the fleſh of your foreſkin; fourthly, God informs us what is the end or uſe of this covenant of circumciſion, It ſhall be a *token* of the covenant betwixt HIM and Abraham.

Here the covenant of circumciſion equals every man-child being circumciſed; every man-child being circumciſed equals the circumciſing the fleſh of their foreſkin; the circumciſing the fleſh of their foreſkin equals the *token* of the covenant betwixt God and Abraham; hence, the *token* of the covenant betwixt God and Abraham equals the covenant of circumciſion; for it is a well known axiom, That things that are equal to the ſame are equal to one another: hence, Sir, you muſt ſay, that a *token* of a covenant is the *covenant itſelf*, which is abſurd, or that the covenant of circumciſion is a covenant in diſtinction from the covenant of grace, or in diſtinction from that covenant which contains the promiſes.

Beſides, if you will ſtill hold that the covenant of circumciſion and that of grace are the ſame thing, you fall into another abſurdity, which ought to alarm you, and it will confound your ſentiment. The abſurdity is this,—If the covenant of grace, which contains the promiſe of the Meſſiah, and the covenant of circumciſion, be one and the ſame thing, then the covenant of grace, which contains the promiſe of the Meſſiah, may be broken, and hath been thouſands of times; for the covenant of circumciſion was broken every time and as often as any male child among the Jews was not circumciſed, Gen. xvii. 14. Thus abſurd are your notions of the covenant of circumciſion; and by theſe abſurd notions, you would lead men blindfold into the antichriſtian notion of infant baptiſm: for, ſay as much as you pleaſe, there is not one of your hearers or readers, who can ſee that infant baptiſm, as a goſpel duty, is found in the Jewiſh rite of circumciſion. By ſuch dark notions you may lead the blind blindfold, but you can never in this way inſtruct the ignorant, or reclaim thoſe who wander out of the way. Chriſt hath no where taught you to teach thus, and you ought to be careful how you thus teach for the future.

You probably may ſuppoſe that you have an objection of ſome magnitude, againſt my idea of the covenant of circumciſion, becauſe it is ſaid, Gen. xvii. 13. 'My covenant ſhall be *in your fleſh* for an *everlaſting covenant*.' *Anſ.* This *everlaſting covenant* of circumciſion was to be of the ſame duration with the *everlaſting poſſeſſion* which the Lord promiſed to give the ſeed of Abraham, in the land of Canaan, verſe 8: neither of them was intended to continue without end.

Your denomination are often, if not continually, telling the world about circumciſion being a *ſeal* of the *covenant*. You would much oblige us, would you inform us by what authority you employ this *blind* to prevent the ignorant from ſeeing.

We read, Rom. iv. 11. of circumciſion being a *ſeal* of the *righteouſneſs* of *Abraham's faith*, but this gives you no authority to impoſe upon your hearers the falſe and miſchievous idea of its being a ſeal of the covenant, and ſo they muſt have their children ſprinkled, to put them into the covenant. A more wicked idea the *man of ſin* probably never advanced to a credulous world.

By this time you may conclude that either you or I know nothing about the covenant of circumciſion. That the readers may judge for themſelves, and know where the truth lies, I will ſet down, in the margin, the texts which ſpeak of circumciſion, from Geneſis to Revelation.*

You ſay, page 84, ſpeaking of the covenant of grace, "If circumciſion was a ſeal of this covenant, which preceded Chriſt, and is aboliſhed, beyond all queſtion baptiſm is ordained in its ſtead. I ſhould admit this, if I were a Baptiſt." Admit what, Sir, if you were a Baptiſt? "If circumciſion was a ſeal of this covenant." Yes, Sir, if circumciſion were a *ſeal* of the *covenant of grace*, and all who were circumciſed were *ſealed* in this covenant of grace, we would admit juſt what you might pleaſe to preſcribe. But, Sir, the whole of this buſineſs of circumciſion being a ſeal, as multitudes are in our day made to believe, is a mere farce, or religious impoſition.

I now leave the covenant of circumciſion to your future conſideration, and come to review a few of your words which relate to Lydia. Speaking of what I obſerved of Lydia and her houſehold, after mentioning ſeveral things which I ſuggeſted, and leaving out the little evidence which I ſet down, namely, 'That Paul entered into the houſe of Lydia, and there comforted the brethren,' you ſay, "Theſe ſuppoſitions, Sir, may be founded in truth, but who knows that they are; who, that can juſtly make any pretenſions to impartiality, can believe them without evidence?" Your

* Gen. xvii. 10—14, 23—27. xxxiv. 15, 17, 22, 24. Exod. iv. 26. Deut. x. 16. xxx. 6. Joſh. v. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8. Jere. iv. 4. ix. 25, 26. Luke ii. 21. John vii. 22, 23. Acts vii. 8. x. 45. xi. 2, 3. xv. 1, 5. xvi. 3. xxi. 21. Rom. ii. 25, 26, 28, 29. iii. 1, 30. iv. 9—12. xv. 8. 1 Cor. vii. 18, 19. Gal. ii. 3, 7, 8, 9. v. 2, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15. Eph. ii. 11. Phil. iii. 3, 5. Col. ii. 11. iii. 11. iv. 11.

concluſion is, "Upon the whole, as ſuppoſitions are miſerable arguments, the evidence is left juſt where you found it."

Were I, Sir, to join with you in ſentiment, and were your readers to be of the ſame opinion, that *ſuppoſitions* are *miſerable arguments*, we might all of us have one idea ſuggeſted to our minds at the ſame moment, whether your arguments be not all of them of that deſcription. But, eſpecially if ſuppoſitions be miſerable arguments, why do you and your denomination reſt the important points of baptiſm and its ſubjects on juſt ſuch miſerable arguments? For, make the beſt of the arguments for infant ſprinkling, or even for infant baptiſm, they are but ſuppoſitions, and but poor improbable ones too; yet, in the face of your brethren, you ſay, *ſuppoſitions* are *miſerable arguments*. Such an aſſertion, if true, is enough to ruin the practice of infant ſprinkling, or at leaſt the credit of ſuch a practice.

You *ſuppoſe* that *baptizō* is ſometimes uſed for ſprinkling or partial waſhing, but you produce no evidence, unleſs it be ſuppoſititious evidence, that it is ever once ſo uſed in any part of the Bible.

You ſuppoſe that *baptizō* is ſometimes uſed as equivalent with *niptō*, but you find no place where it is thus uſed, or have no evidence that it is thus, unleſs it be ſuppoſed evidence, which comes only to ſuppoſition.

You ſuppoſe that *baptiſmois* is uſed for the application of fluids in every way, but ſtill you want evidence.

You ſuppoſe that Chriſt's bleſſing little children is an argument in favour of infant baptiſm.

You ſuppoſe that what Peter ſaid about the promiſe of the Spirit, as being to parents and children, even to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call, is for infant baptiſm.

You ſuppoſe that the baptiſm of Lydia's houſehold, of the jailer's houſehold, and of Stephanas's, are all in favour of infant baptiſm.

You *ſuppoſe* that many other things are alſo in its favour; but it is all but bare ſuppoſition, for not a ſyllable is mentioned of infant baptiſm from Geneſis to Revelation. Now, is it not ſurpriſing that you ſhould tell the world, (not your opponents only, but your friends too) that *ſuppoſitions* are *miſerable arguments?* In fact, Sir, if this be admitted, and ſhould it be generally received, that ſuppoſitions are miſerable arguments, your *examination* of my Sermons will loſe its influence, and ſo will your whole cauſe of ſprinkling and infant baptiſm.

The next thing to be noticed, is your reply to the following propoſition. I obſerved, 'Abraham's children after the fleſh were not included in the promiſe, as Pædobaptiſts of our day would have theirs.' You reply, as though you did not underſtand me—"If you mean (ſay you) that they were not all participants in the bleſſings of the promiſe, it is admitted." If you, Sir, did not underſtand me before, I will endeavour that you may now. What I mean is this—'They which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God, but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed; for this is the word of promiſe, At this time will I come, and Sara ſhall have a ſon,' Rom. ix. 8, 9. Not, Hagar ſhall have a ſon; not, Keturah ſhall have ſix ſons. Abraham had eight ſons, but Iſaac was the only one of the eight to whom was the promiſe. Now, you ſay this promiſe, which was to Abraham and his ſeed, is to you and to all your children: hence you, having eight ſons, claim the promiſe to each of the eight, when Abraham could claim it but for one of his. Do you and your brethren ſuppoſe, that you have each one of you eight parts in the promiſe, and Abraham but one? It is no wonder, Sir, that you could not underſtand me. I deſire that you might, for the future, have a good underſtanding, when you ſpeak of the promiſe, as being to you and to your children, and of putting them into the covenant, or putting the *ſeal* of the covenant upon them.

In pages 88, 89, you have the remarkable paſſage which follows: "In pages 96, 97, and 98, (i. e. of my Sermons) you run (ſay you) the doctrine of pædobaptiſm into what you call legitimate conſequences: they are eight in number, and they are frightful things indeed. If you have ſuppoſed pædobaptiſm embarraſſed with all theſe conſequences, I am perfectly aſtoniſhed how you could find a conſcience to practiſe it, as you have done."

Reply. Is it not, Sir, more aſtoniſhing that you can practiſe it, after theſe conſequences are laid before you? But you find a very eaſy way to get rid, as you ſuppoſe, of the whole difficulty: the way you take is this—ſay you, "All theſe conſequences, Sir, will be denied by every *intelligent advocate* for infant baptiſm." How intelligent, I will not preſume to ſay, a perſon muſt be, to hold a premiſe and deny all the legitimate conſequences. Should you, or any of your denomination, hereafter undertake to deny the conſequences which I drew, you are deſired to ſtate the principle, and then ſhow the diſagreement between that and my conſe-

quences. The principle of the Pædobaptiſts is this—"The ſubjects of baptiſm are to be determined by the ſubjects of circumciſion." The firſt account which we have of the ſubjects of circumciſion, and perhaps as particular account as any which is given us, is in the family of Abraham. Abraham was a great and good man, and on his account all the males in his houſe were to be circumciſed, whether they were young or old, his own children, or bought with money, or born in his houſe. Before he was commanded to circumciſe his houſehold, he had three hundred and eighteen training ſoldiers, born in his own houſe: how many more were born in his houſe, or bought with his money, before the day of their circumciſion, we know not; but let it be more or leſs, one thing is certain, they were all to be circumciſed, on account of Abraham's being a good man, full of faith.

Now, Sir, your principle, or the principle of your denomination, is, that the ſubjects of baptiſm are to be determined by the ſubjects of circumciſion.

Hence, my *firſt* conſequence was—Every man who is converted to the Chriſtian religion is to be baptized, and all his houſehold, though he may have three hundred and eighteen training ſoldiers born in his own houſe. Not only are theſe ſoldiers, but their wives and children, and all other ſervants who belong to this great man's houſe. A thouſand infidels are to be baptized, becauſe one great man, their maſter, is chriſtianized.

My *ſecond* conſequence was—Theſe ſoldiers, with their wives, children, and ſervants, are all to be conſidered and treated as church members, or as being in covenant: in the covenant of circumciſion, or ſome ſimilar.

Thus were the circumciſed conſidered and treated. If baptiſm have taken the place of circumciſion, and the ſubjects of the one are to be determined by the other, then muſt theſe ſoldiers, wives, and children be conſidered and treated in the ſame manner.

The other conſequences the reader will find in my ſixth Sermon, and conſult them at his leiſure.

Now, Sir, how you could, without mentioning either principle or conſequence, tell the world, both learned and unlearned, "that all theſe conſequences will be denied by every *intelligent advocate* for infant baptiſm," is a little to be wondered at. I have hardly intelligence enough to underſtand what you intend by an intelligent advocate for infant baptiſm. By what you have ſaid, I ſhould naturally enough

conclude, that by an intelligent advocate for infant baptiſm, you intend one who knows how to advocate principles and deny the natural conſequences, and deduce others to his liking.

You ſay, "That my conſequences are *frightful* things." I drew them that you might attend to them, and be *frightened* or driven from your antichriſtian principle: but you ſtill hold the principle, at leaſt in meaſure, and ſecure or content yourſelf under the idea, that every intelligent advocate for infant baptiſm will deny my conſequences. How you will anſwer it to the Britiſh church, to the popes of Rome, and to a multitude of other learned Pædobaptiſts, who have practiſed upon a number of my concluſions, and admitted the reſt as true, ſave the fifth and laſt, for placing them among the unintelligents, is left for you to determine.

The laſt conſequence which I drew from this Pædobaptiſt principle, That the ſubjects of baptiſm are to be determined by the ſubjects of circumciſion, is—It doth, ſo far as it hath its perfect work, deſtroy the very idea of the goſpel church, contradict the prophets, and make Paul and others ſpeak not the truth; and it throws us back to the ſtate of the Jewiſh church.

To this you ſee fit to reply, and your reply hath the appearance of a laboured attempt to confound the diſtinction between the Jewiſh church and the goſpel church, and to make your readers believe them to be both one and the ſame thing. Your very reply goes to prove that your principle would, if true, throw us back to the ſtate of the Jewiſh church; and thus it proves my conſequence true.

In your reply, you keep a juſt idea of the Jewiſh church altogether out of ſight; you do not mention ſo much as one juſt trait of it. Your arguments to prove the goſpel church and the Jewiſh church to be one, are—*Firſt*, God manifeſted great kindneſs to the Jewiſh church; he carried them as on eagles' wings, and ſome of them greatly rejoiced in the Lord: *Secondly*, That the Jewiſh church conſiſted of ſuch perſons as were Abraham and Iſaac: theſe are your words—"Are Baptiſt churches generally purer, think you, than a church would be compoſed of ſuch perſons as *Abraham*; and where is the inconſiſtency or danger of admitting the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, 1 Cor. vii. 14. that the children are viſibly holy as *Iſaac* was?"

There is, Sir, no inconſiſtency or danger in admitting the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt; but there is both inconſiſtency and danger in *wreſting* the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, or in miſapplying it.

Why, Sir, do you not come out in fair day-light, and tell all your readers, and eſpecially ſuch as love darkneſs rather than light, that the Jewiſh church conſiſted of all the rebellious, ſtiff-necked, and infidel Jews, including Scribes, Phariſees, Sadducees, and all hypocrites among them, as well as the few godly ones who might be found; and that the goſpel church is juſt like the Jewiſh, ſo far as it can be, by including all perſons, of every deſcription, who have been baptized or ſprinkled, and have not been caſt out by regular church diſcipline? Come out thus, and let poor deluded ſouls know your real ſentiment, or a fair ſtatement of it; then might they judge for themſelves. If you deny this being your ſentiment, I will prove it to you. Pages 87, 88, your words are—"I am as much ſhocked at your dereliction of *infant membership* and *infant baptiſm*, as I ſhould have been had you denied the obligation of family prayer." Now, Sir, you believe that baptized or ſprinkled infants are church members: the conſequence is this—A large part, perhaps more than half, of the infants, children, infidels, drunkards, and liars, in our nation, are members of the goſpel church. Sir, either renounce the erroneous principle on which infant baptiſm hangs, or admit the *legitimate* conſequences, and make the beſt of them. If you pleaſe, never again think to get rid of my conſequences, by telling the public that every intelligent advocate for infant baptiſm will deny them.

I have one thing more to notice, in your plea for the goſpel church being the ſame as the Jewiſh: it is this—"How does pædobaptiſm (ſay you) deſtroy the very idea of the goſpel church?" You, Sir, anſwer, "A goſpel church is a body of viſible ſaints or holy perſons." What do you mean by this anſwer? If you mean, by viſible ſaints and holy perſons, ſuch as appear to poſſeſs holineſs of heart, or to be believers in Chriſt, I readily agree to it: but, Sir, you mean no ſuch thing; you mean, a goſpel church is a body of perſons, compoſed of believing parents, together with their baptized or ſprinkled children, let their children be what they may, believers or infidels, if they have not been cut off from the church by diſcipline: or you mean a body of perſons made up of a number of converted heads of families, with their ungodly, unconverted families. See your Letters, pages 90, 91, 92, and elſewhere.

This is the way which your own church is made up, if your practice has been in agreement with your principles—holding to infant membership, and children membership, and ſervant membership.

I do not mention theſe different church memberſhips, becauſe I wiſh to caſt odium on your character, or on that of your brethren, but becauſe I conſider theſe to belong to the inevitable conſequences of your principle, which every *intelligent advocate* for infant baptiſm ought candidly to admit, and becauſe I wiſh to expoſe your antichriſtian principle, and your correſponding antichriſtian practice.

Wiſhing you reformation, in both principle and practice,

I am, &c.

LETTER X.

REVEREND SIR,

I HAVE reviewed, with ſome attention, your Ten Letters, which you conſider as an Examination of my Seven Sermons. In your Letters, which you have given to the public, you have ſaid of me and of my Sermons what you pleaſed. Of your performance, I have nothing to ſay as to its ſtrength or weakneſs, or with reſpect to your aſſertions, repetitions, or arguments; they are all before the public, as are my Sermons, and as this Review I expect will ſoon be. Not only are my Sermons and your Examination before the public, but they are both before HIM, who knows what is truth, and whether either of us, or whether both of us have written and publiſhed with our eye ſingle, and our wills bowed to his.

In this Letter ſeveral things may be laid before you, with a deſire that you may receive the light of goſpel truth, relative to the firſt goſpel ordinance: but, Sir, unleſs God be pleaſed to give you a *large ſhare* of grace, you will not ſo much deſire the light of conviction, as the light by which to refute what I have written. But if there be no hope of your conviction from any argument of mine, yet it is poſſible that you will yield to your own arguments; for you have, indeed, given us the outlines of an argument or two, the force of which I ſee not how you will handſomely evade.

Your firſt premiſe is—"There muſt be ſome evident likeneſs between the ſubject to which a word is applied in the natural, primitive uſe of it, and the ſubject to which it is applied as a figure, otherwiſe there is a groſs impropriety in the figurative uſe of it." You cannot eaſily get rid of the plain truth of this your major propoſition.

Your ſecond premiſe is—The baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt is a ſubject to which the words burying and riſing as from the dead, are applied as a figure, and water baptiſm is undoubtedly a *ſymbol* of the baptiſm of the *Holy Ghoſt.* Theſe are your *own premiſes*, (ſee pages 61, 44, 33, 34.) You are deſired to draw your *own concluſion.*

You will permit me to refreſh your memory, with a confeſſion and promiſe, which you made to me in your firſt Letter, and in theſe words, "As for me, I conſider truth infinitely preferable to any party intereſt, and *promiſe* to you that I will yield to evidence, as ſoon as it is preſented."

Another of your arguments in favour of the Baptiſts ſhall be preſented; for I ſincerely wiſh that your arguments may be found unanſwerable, and that they may inſtrumentally produce your thorough converſion.

Your major propoſition, in this ſecond argument, is—The ſubject in debate between the Baptiſts and Pædobaptiſts, is of great importance, and it *can* be brought to an iſſue, and it *muſt* be brought to an iſſue. (See page 98.)

Your minor propoſition is—"All the treatiſes and ſchemes which the Pædobaptiſts have produced, in order to ſettle this debate, have been *embarraſſed* with material objections," page 95. It therefore *cannot* be brought to an iſſue upon their *embarraſſed treatiſes* or *ſchemes*, "but it *can* be brought to an iſſue, and it *muſt* be brought to an iſſue."

Concluſion—We *can* be Baptiſts, and we *muſt* be Baptiſts, and that will bring the *debate* to an *iſſue.*

Now, Sir, I will preſent you with an argument or two, which may be partly yours and partly mine.

What I ſay is, The plain, the literal, the common meaning of the word to baptize is to immerſe, bury, overwhelm, put into water, or the like: you ſay this is the meaning ſometimes, eſpecially when it means to baptize with the Holy Ghoſt, and water baptiſm is undoubtedly a ſymbol of the baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt; therefore, the plain, literal, and common ſenſe of the baptiſmal command is, that the ſubjects of baptiſm ſhould be immerſed, buried, or put into water, or the like.

Again—what I ſay is, The word to baptize hath in the Bible no meaning different from immerſion, overwhelming, or the like. You have tried, and have found nothing, to *prove* that it hath any oppoſite meaning, except it be by ſuppoſitions, which you ſay are miſerable arguments: therefore, the only Bible meaning of the word to baptize is to immerſe, overwhelm, or the like; or at moſt, there is nothing againſt it but *miſerable arguments.*

Again—The word baptiſm, and even in Heb. ix. 10. where it is ſaid divers baptiſms, the meaning is divers applications of water to divers ſubjects, all which imply immerſion, or putting into water, or the like, or at beſt there is nothing but ſuppoſitions againſt this being the ſenſe; and even if it had any different ſenſe, ſince the goſpel baptiſm is but one baptiſm, and this is certainly immerſion ſometimes, as when they were baptized IN the river, and when they were baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, of which water baptiſm is a ſymbol; and, conſequently, at all times; the concluſion is ſtill the ſame—that the *only goſpel baptiſm* is by *immerſion*.

Another matter, quite worthy of your attention, I have to lay before you and your brethren: it is this—You and your brethren have preſumed to claim ſome authority, or at leaſt credit, for pædobaptiſm, and for ſprinkling children, from confeſſors and martyrs, who have held thoſe traditionary practices. Now, Sir, the fact appears to be, that you have not the leaſt ſhadow of ground for any of your pretended authority or credit from this quarter. It is manifeſt, that you do but amuſe and miſlead your hearers and readers, in the whole of this buſineſs. Where are your martyrs, who have died in defence of pædobaptiſm and ſprinkling? Do you find them in Fox's martyrology? Do you find them in the Bible? Do you find them any where? No, Sir, you find no ſuch martyrs, either amongſt Proteſtants or Papiſts. You find good men and martyrs amongſt thoſe who have embraced the error of baptizing children, and even among thoſe who may have conſented to ſprinkle them; but not one who has ever laid down his life as a witneſs for either of thoſe errors; indeed, there has been no call for any to do thus; for his holineſs the pope, and his *clergy*, the *cage* of unclean birds, and other portions of antichriſt, have never oppoſed theſe errors. It appears that Satan would be divided againſt himſelf, ſhould he ſtimulate any of his ſubjects to perſecute unto death any good men, for holding either of theſe antichriſtian traditions. But both Papiſts and Proteſtant Pædobaptiſts have perſecuted unto various kinds of death, the Baptiſts, who have nobly laid down their lives, as witneſſes for the goſpel baptiſm and the goſpel ſubjects.

For oppoſing infant baptiſm, and for maintaining the doctrine of the Baptiſts, hundreds, about the year 1529, were put to death at Saltzburg, in the Palatinate, at Altze, in Germany, and at many other places, and at many other times.*

* See Croſby's Hiſtory of the Engliſh Baptiſts, Preface, page 30; and Hiſtory, pages 32, 42, &c.

The general manner of their death was to be beheaded, roaſted, or drowned.

It would, indeed, have been a ſurpriſing thing, had it been as you and your brethren intimate, that good men have died as witneſſes of the traditions of popes and councils. Wicked men may die, in vindication of their own errors; but we are not to expect that good men will die as martyrs, for the errors which the wicked have propagated among the ſaints. You will be kind enough, I hope, never to force this argument into your ſervice again, till you can, amongſt all the martyrs of Jeſus, find one who has been called to lay down his life, as a witneſs to your error of ſprinkling children.

Your attention is requeſted, Sir, to one thing more. You and your brethren are not only contrary from both the Old Teſtament and the New, but you are contrary from each other, and you begin to be contrary from all men. From your Examination of my Sermons, pages 12, 13, 16, 17, you appear not to know when baptiſm is to be adminiſtered; whether at the time when members are admitted into the church, ſoon after it, or long after, or whether it be neceſſary at all, in order to church membership, or whether before or after the Lord's ſupper. When men come to know nothing about a ſubject, prudence dictates that it is time to drop it. You would never traverſe ſuch a crooked courſe, with relation to baptiſm, did you underſtand how to go ſtraight. You would, Sir, do well to ſay no more about baptiſm, or elſe take the Bible for your guide, or pay ſome attention to the church of Chriſt, which is the *pillar* and *ground* of the *truth:* you now ſet aſide both, and hence it is that you have loſt ſight of the ſubject. You muſt, indeed, perſuade Chriſtians to believe baptiſm to be of little worth, or they cannot reſt contented with the manner of your handling that important goſpel ordinance.

You inform us, that no one hath written well on the ſubject of baptiſm, or "that there is no ſcheme but what is embarraſſed with *material* objections," (page 94,) or at leaſt, there is none on your ſide of the queſtion but what is thus embarraſſed. At the ſame time, you treat with very little reſpect what hath been attempted by the Baptiſts: this being the caſe, the public will probably expect not only ſomething new on the ſubject, and ſomething great, but ſomething free of embarraſſments, when you ſhall ſee fit to favour them with your volume, which you encourage us to expect.

Wiſhing you the true knowledge of goſpel baptiſm,

I am, &c.

LETTER XI.

REVEREND SIR,

HAVING traverſed through your Letters, I proceed to your Appendix. In it you were pleaſed to notice my pamphlet, entitled, *Open Communion with all who keep the Ordinances as Chriſt delivered them to the Saints.* "As it comes out in the form of letters, addreſſed to Mr. Anderſon, the duty of replying to it (ſay you) is properly his, I ſhall not take it out of his hands, but beg leave to trouble you with a few remarks on what I find in this work."

Mr. Anderſon is, Sir, confeſſedly the proper perſon to reply, and no doubt he will, if he ſtill conſider his ground defenſible, and have arguments at hand for the buſineſs; but as my Letters to him were not of a private or perſonal nature, but implicated all his denomination, as being with him in the ſame error, he probably will not take it unkindly, that you ſent out your Appendix, as a precurſor to what might follow. You, Sir, it is preſumed, ſaid but little in your Appendix, compared with what you conſider might be ſaid; you will, therefore, not be offended, ſhould I, whilſt replying to you, keep ſomething in reſerve againſt Mr. Anderſon ſhall appear with the main body of arguments: I ſhall, however, endeavour to ſilence ſome of your ſuppoſed refutation, and remove your ſuppoſed ſtrength, in which you truſt.

It is worthy to be noticed, that in the ſecond page of your Appendix, you tell me, "that I am reſponſible to the religious public, to prove that to baptize invariably means to immerſe, and that only." I conſider this, Sir, to be already done, at leaſt ſo far that you have not been able to diſprove it: beſides, this point may receive ſome additional light, before the Letters now writing ſhall be cloſed.

You add, in the ſame page, "The world muſt not be impoſed upon by round aſſertions and dogmatic declamation," nor by *ſuppoſitions*, you ſhould have ſaid. "We are not (ſay you) to be put out of the viſible ſociety of believers, but for ſome evident diſqualifying reaſon. And now you are ſeriouſly called upon to prove from the Bible, what with ſuch an air of certainty you aſſume." Have patience with me, and if the Lord will, I ſhall endeavour all you aſk: this you may expect in my next Letter.

In page 99, you tell us, that "the difficulty is wholly on our part, and that it is without foundation." Here, Sir, you miſtake in whole. Is the difficulty on our part, when you are continually taking from the people the *key* of *knowledge*, by *wreſting* the Scriptures, by miſapplying them, and by many erroneous interpretations, ſo far as they reſpect goſpel baptiſm and its ſubjects? Not only ſo, but ye enter not into the kingdom of heaven yourſelves, and them that are entering in ye hinder. The whole tenor of your Letters to me, is to juſtify your own neglect of duty, as it reſpects baptiſm, and to prevent others from complying with theirs: or, (to expreſs the matter in milder terms,) the manifeſt object of your Letters is to juſtify your practice of ſprinkling inſtead of immerſion, and to encourage others to believe and practiſe the ſame, when you have not found, and cannot find, one ſentence or word in all the Scriptures, to warrant your practice, or juſtify your departure from goſpel baptiſm. You have ſearched, and by ſearching have found that you have nothing but ſuppoſitions and uncertain conjectures, for your infant ſprinkling or infant baptiſm. *Miſerable baſis* this, for the foundation of our faith in the firſt goſpel ordinance. On ſuch a baſis ſtands your faith; and by ſuch weak and beggarly arguments would you drive us from goſpel baptiſm, or to conſent to the validity of ſprinkling; and not only ſo, but you contend with us, becauſe we chooſe not to reſt our faith and venture our practice on ſuch conjectural ground, when we have for our preſent faith and practice the broad baſis of all the Bible, fairly and unequivocally in our favour, ſo far as it mentions the ſubject. You ſurely ought to have had better arguments, and ſome facts in your favour, before you pronounced, in the face of inſpiration and before the world, "that the difficulty is wholly on the Baptiſts' part, and without foundation."

The next and laſt thing in your pamphlet is now to be conſidered: it is your particular refutation of my ſentiments on open communion with all who keep the ordinances as Chriſt delivered them to the ſaints. This your ſuppoſed refutation muſt have a particular examination, for it is calculated to miſlead thoſe who examine things very partially.

I propoſe to ſtate your refutation as explicitly as I can, and try its ſtrength as conciſely as may be. You begin your refutation thus—"The leading principles of your defence ſeem to be theſe:—

"I. The fault, ſay you, is wholly ours, becauſe we refuſe to ſubmit to an expreſsly appointed ordinance of the

goſpel." "We contend, that we as ſeriouſly reverence, and as conſcientiouſly obſerve this ordinance, as the Baptiſts: but your manner of applying water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, has nothing to do with baptiſm: here we are at iſſue. You have yet furniſhed no proof; we have furniſhed *clear demonſtration* to the contrary."

Anſ. This, Sir, is the *whole* of your refutation of what you ſet down for my firſt principle.

I have two queſtions to propoſe, and then ſhall leave this part of your refutation to your future reflections. The *firſt* is, you ſay, "We as ſeriouſly reverence, and as conſcientiouſly obſerve the goſpel ordinance of baptiſm, as the Baptiſts." What do you call a ſerious and conſcientious obſervance of this ordinance? Saying all you can againſt it? Refuſing to ſubmit to it, and ſubſtituting man's invention in the room of it? We wiſh you to be delivered from ſuch ſerious and conſcientious obſervances of the commandments and inventions of men. Beſides, it is your ſentiment, that this ordinance is to be obſerved or received when we are infants, when we can know nothing about it. How much *ſerious reverence* and *conſcientiouſneſs infants* have we know not. *Secondly*—The ſtrength of your refutation is ſuppoſed, no doubt, to be in your concluding words, which are, "You have yet furniſhed no proof; we have furniſhed *clear demonſtration* to the contrary." This is worthy of obſervation—"We have furniſhed (ſay you) clear demonſtration!" The queſtion is, to whom? and where? we have not ſeen it. *Clear* demonſtration! this is all we want: if you have furniſhed it, it ought to have been written in capitals, that not one of your readers ſhould have paſſed it over unnoticed. The truth is, you have miſtaken the buſineſs: you have furniſhed no demonſtration of any kind, ſave it be this, that you are oppoſing the only goſpel baptiſm, and that the contrary from what you advocate is true.

Your ſtatement of my next principle is,

"II. You tell us, (ſay you to me) the perfect idea in the preſent controverſy is, "The actual communion at the Lord's table is to be confined to baptized believers."

This principle, Sir, you implicitly grant to be true, and my ſtatement juſt; and contend that you are baptized; and, inſtead of *clear demonſtration*, bring in your congregations as witneſſes that you have been the ſubjects of goſpel baptiſm, by your having been ſprinkled in your infancy, which is a mere human ſubſtitute for goſpel baptiſm. But, Sir, you

know, or ought to, that theſe congregations, from whom you have ſo taken the key of knowledge, that they know not what baptiſm is, or to whom it ſhould be adminiſtered, are no witneſſes in this caſe. You have taught them to miſunderſtand the plain ſenſe of the Bible, and to read ſprinkling for baptiſm, and Abraham's houſehold for diſciples of Chriſt; and now would conſtrain us to admit them as witneſſes. No, Sir, we ſhall admit no ſuch ſuborned or tutored evidence: we aſk for your *clear demonſtration.*

III. You ſtate my *third* principle to be—"The being born of water or baptiſm, is the perfect and viſible line of ſeparation between the viſible kingdom of Chriſt and the kingdoms of this world." "Your grand, and as far as I have obſerved, your only text to prove this is John iii. 5. 'Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But this darling doctrine is refuted—

"1. By what you do; for you baptize perſons upon the ground of evidence that they have been already born of the Spirit, and therefore are, before baptiſm, viſible believers." *Anſ.* This, Sir, we at once grant, but how does this refute my doctrine? But you add, "and of the kingdom," as though to be a *viſible believer*, and a *member* of the *viſible* kingdom of Chriſt, were one and the ſame thing. By thus confounding things you may keep truth out of ſight, and blind your readers, but you can never in this way refute my doctrine.

"2. This darling doctrine (ſay you to me) is refuted by what you ſay; for you tell us, that John's baptiſm was goſpel baptiſm; that the multitudes from all Judea and Jeruſalem, who embraced John's baptiſm, previouſly brought forth fruits of repentance, yet when they were baptized they were only prepared to be introduced into the kingdom of the Meſſiah." Sir, I find no fault when you miſquote my words, provided you retain the idea, but here you have miſtaken both. Speaking of the people made ready and prepared by John, my words are, page 49, 'Of this people, and of this only, for aught appears, Chriſt took and formed the firſt *viſible goſpel* church; or this *prepared people* were the church, though not yet organized.' Had you quoted my words, this part of your refutation might have been ſpared.

3. You tell me that my doctrine "is refuted by the text itſelf; for whatever be deſigned by the kingdom of God, and whatever is to be underſtood here by being born of water and of the Spirit, both are neceſſary, as pre-requiſites

to a perſon's entering into the kingdom of God. The *birth* goes before the *entrance.*" *Anſ.* If you will be kind enough to inform the public for how long a time a perſon muſt be born before he enters into the world, then they will poſſeſs a neceſſary datum to underſtand your new doctrine, that the *birth* goes before the *entrance;* till you do this, your third refutation might alſo have been ſpared, for the public will not be able to underſtand this new doctrine, without ſome clue to it. In the mean time, the common ſenſe of the public will lead them to believe my doctrine, that the *birth* is the *entrance.*

Say you again, "The being born of water is placed before being born of the Spirit." *Anſ.* If you will read the third verſe, which you had juſt mentioned, which ſpeaks of being born again, you may find your miſtake.

4. My doctrine, you ſay, "is refuted by abundance of other Scripture evidence; for example, there were multitudes who belonged to the viſible kingdom of God before Chriſt, who were not born of water." *Anſ.* You ought, Sir, to have told us where this Scripture evidence is, which proves that what Chriſt ſaid is not true. Chriſt ſaith, 'Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' You ſay there is Scripture evidence, that multitudes have belonged to the viſible kingdom of God before Chriſt, who were not born of water. Beſides, Sir, Chriſt ſpeaks, Mat. iv. 17. of the kingdom of heaven as not having made its public appearance, but as being then at hand. Where you ſee fit to contradict Jeſus Chriſt, in direct terms, I leave you to anſwer it to him.

In the next place, you tell us, "that Chriſt himſelf was never born of water." Had you forgotten, or did you ſuppoſe that none of your readers would recollect, Mark i. 9. that Jeſus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John IN Jordan?

Again, ſay you, "Matthew and Levi, Philip and Nathanael, Andrew and Peter, and probably the reſt of Chriſt's diſciples, were not born of water, as the commencement of their viſible ſtanding as his diſciples." But had not theſe been born of water, baptized, of John? Had not John made them ready?

"The penitent thief upon the croſs (ſay you) was not born of water, and yet the atteſtation of Chriſt in his behalf determines him to be a viſible member of his kingdom." Here, Sir, you have either a double intention, or you di-

rectly contradict the Saviour; in either caſe I leave you to your own reflections. Beſides, our Lord did not ſay that the thief belonged to his viſible kingdom, but that he ſhould that day be with him in paradiſe.

Again, you ſay, "Cornelius, Paul, and the Ethiopian eunuch, were certainly viſible believers before they were born of water." Did any perſon ever deny it? I certainly do not, nor ever did: but this is as far from the ſubject in debate, as the north is from the ſouth. The queſtion, which you appear to have forgotten, is, Whether any ever belonged to the kingdom of God, the viſible church, without being born of water? Not whether any have been believers before they were born of water: for my principle is, and the principle of the Bible is, that none are to be baptized but viſible believers, and that ſuch are to be baptized, and thus introduced into the viſible church.

5. "Your doctrine (ſay you to me) is refuted by what you preſume is my view of the condition of many who die, either in their infancy, or childhood, or youth, without having ever been immerſed."

Anſ. Do you ſuppoſe that I believe that infants, and children, and youth, who have not been immerſed, belong to the viſible kingdom of God? If you do, you moſt certainly muſt be quite unacquainted with what I believe. Perhaps your idea is this, that I believe ſome infants, children, and youth, who have not been immerſed, may go to heaven, and be finally ſaved. This, Sir, I do believe; but what hath this to do with the preſent controverſy? As ſoon as you ſhall underſtandingly compare this part of your ſuppoſed refutation with the doctrine to be refuted, you will ſee that they have no connexion with each other, and the one can never be injured by the other.

You cloſe your refutation of my excluſive doctrine, as you term it, by ſaying, "It is enough, if the ſingle principle of your excluſive doctrine is found to be unſcriptural." True, Sir, this would be enough; and had you been able to have found one ſcripture againſt it, you would have deſerved well; but a thouſand texts which ſay nothing about it, will never prove it unſcriptural.

Upon another of my leading principles, you obſerve,

"IV. To juſtify your denying us communion at the Lord's table, you ſay, 'Not the leaſt intimation is given, that ever one was admitted to the Lord's table prior to his being baptized.' In reply to this, I obſerve,

"1. That our proof that we are baptized is as clear as

yours is that you are baptized." *Anſ.* This is the very thing for you to prove.

"2. It is evident (ſay you) that the diſciples were admitted to communion with their Lord at the ſupper, and yet there is no evidence that they were ever baptized." *Anſ.* There is no evidence but they were, and ſo it helps you not. Such arguments would never help a good cauſe. Beſides, there is evidence that they were baptized, Luke vii. 29. 'And all the people that heard him, —— juſtified God, being baptized with the baptiſm of John;' and thus it ruins this part of your cauſe.

"3. The expreſs command of Chriſt to his followers, indiſcriminately, is, Do this in remembrance of me. You muſt, therefore, prove, either that we are not his followers, or that you have a warrant to diſpenſe with that law, and deny us the privilege of complying with it." Certainly, Sir, I muſt prove one of theſe, and nothing is eaſier than to prove the firſt—that you are not his followers, in that very example, the copying of which is indiſpenſable, if you will enter into his viſible kingdom. Chriſt was baptized IN Jordan; you refuſe to be baptized any where; you will only be ſprinkled: thus you are not his followers in the firſt goſpel ordinance; and he hath no where commanded you, or any others, to partake of the ſecond ordinance, whilſt they neglect, much leſs whilſt they deny the firſt. You have never viſibly forſaken all that you have for Chriſt's ſake and the goſpel's: in no other way can you become Chriſt's viſible diſciples, ſee Luke xiv. 33. There is but one way pointed out in the goſpel, by which we are manifeſtly to forſake all, at the commencement of our viſible diſcipleſhip, and that *one* way is to be born, into his kingdom, *of* water, or to be baptized. You reject this counſel of God againſt yourſelves—you refuſe to be born of water, or to be baptized; you, therefore, are, in this important article, not his followers, and ſo *not* of the viſible kingdom of heaven. There is no law which requires you to come, till you be followers of Chriſt, and members of his viſible kingdom, nor is there any law of Chriſt's which allows you to come before: we are, therefore, under obligation to refuſe you admittance among us.

You ſay, again, "You muſt ſhow us that Chriſt has ſomewhere made this deficiency, (i. e. the want of baptiſm) in all caſes, a bar to communion at his table." No, Sir, ſhow us where any have liberty to come with this deficiency about them.

Page 105, you quote the following lines—

> " Do this, he cries, till time ſhall end,
> " In mem'ry of your dying Friend;
> " Meet at my table and record
> " The love of your departed Lord."

" We feel (ſay you) all the tenderneſs of this invitation, and ſolicit a place among the gueſts." We ſay, come and welcome; but come according to the pattern, example, and commandment given. But you make my anſwer to be very different: you tell the public that my reply to your ſolicitation is, " No, avaunt, you are not among the followers of Jeſus; you are *unbaptized heathen*." This, Sir, is an imprudent expreſſion; and I have juſt cauſe to call you to account before the public, for manufacturing ſuch an indecent anſwer, and palming it upon your readers as being mine. You have, Sir, ſaid hard things enough in your pamphlet, without this attempt to make me appear uncivil.

By what you ſay, pages 106, 107, it is manifeſt, that you are quite diſpleaſed with the name given to your denomination, which is peculiarly your own. By the name Pædorantiſts, you ought ever willingly to be known, till you change your practice. If you diſlike your name, do you ſuppoſe that the great Head of the church will be pleaſed with your practice, which anſwers exactly to it? You conſider Pædorantiſts to be a contemptuous name; if it indeed be ſo, your practice is a contemptuous practice, for the name and the practice perfectly agree together. Your practice is indeed contemptuous, for it contemns the ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt, for which it is ſubſtituted. By this ſubſtitution you have polluted the ordinance of the Lord, or made it void by the traditions of men; and it is time for you to inquire how you ſhall anſwer, when he ſhall aſk by what authority you have done theſe things. The argument which you now uſe, that great and learned men have thus done, will be but a poor one then. This argument is no better than the Jews might have uſed in Nehemiah's day, when their fathers had not kept the feaſt of tabernacles in its order, according to the command, for a thouſand years. The truth is, from the days of *your* fathers ye have gone away from the Lord's ordinance of baptiſm, and have not kept it. Return unto the Lord, and he will return unto you.

I agree, Sir, never to give you the appellation, Pædorantiſts, after you ſhall produce one example, precept, or fair and full Scripture conſequence, to ſhow that *ſprinkling* is ſo much as once, in all the Bible, put for Chriſtian baptiſm.

If this cannot be done, you do not appear to advantage, to manifeſt any uneaſineſs at your name, which perfectly deſignates your practice, and diſtinguiſhes your denomination. Your practice, and not your name, ſhould diſpleaſe you.

You intimate, page 107, that I ſhall oblige you, and many of your denomination, by explaining what I mean by addreſſing Mr. Anderſon, Brother Anderſon. This is eaſily done: by it I mean this—To manifeſt my belief that he is born of the Spirit, notwithſtanding he refuſes to be born of water.

In the cloſe of your Appendix, you appeal from all authors, both Greek and Roman, from Jerome, Calvin, and Dr. Gill, from all corruptions and ſuperadditions of any church, or the world, to that good book, which is by way of eminence called the word of God.

In the laſt words of your poſtſcript, you make a formal appeal, in theſe words—"But to the Bible, Sir, to the Bible." Haſt thou appealed unto the Bible? unto the Bible ſhalt thou go.

Wiſhing you a full hearing, a fair trial, and your errors a juſt condemnation,

I am, &c.

LETTER XII.

REVEREND SIR,

HAST thou appealed unto the BIBLE? unto the BIBLE ſhalt thou go.

Pleaſe to attend to the following, and the BIBLE will you ſee for *Goſpel Baptiſm.*

Here, Sir, is the BIBLE for baptiſm, to which you have appealed, and by which you and ſome of your works are now to be tried.

The following are all the texts which clearly ſpeak of goſpel baptiſm.

1. Mat. iii. 5, 6, 7. Then went out to him Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him IN Jordan: — but when he ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadducees come to his baptiſm, he ſaid, &c.

2. Ver. 11. I indeed baptize you with water, &c.

3. Ver. 13, 14, 15, 16. Then cometh Jeſus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him; but John forbade him, ſaying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comeſt thou to me? And Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto him, Suffer it to be ſo now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteouſneſs: then he ſuffered him. And Jeſus, when he was baptized, went up ſtraightway out of the water.

4. Chap. xxi. 25, 26, 27. The baptiſm of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men? And they *reaſoned* with *themſelves*, &c.

5. Chap. xxviii. 19. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, &c.

6. Mark i. 4, 5. John did baptize in the wilderneſs, and preach the baptiſm of repentance for the remiſſion of ſins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jeruſalem, and were all baptized of him IN the river of Jordan, &c.

7. Ver. 8, 9, 10. I indeed have baptized you with water. — And it came to paſs in thoſe days, that Jeſus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John IN Jordan. And ſtraightway, coming *up out of* the water, &c.

8. Chap. xi. 30. The baptiſm of John, was it from heaven, or of men?

9. Chap. xvi. 15, 16. And he ſaid unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, &c.

10. Luke iii. 3. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptiſm of repentance, &c.

11. Ver. 7, 8. Then ſaid he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, &c.

12. Ver. 12. Then came alſo publicans to be baptized.

13. Ver. 16. I indeed baptize you with water.

14. Ver. 21. Now, when all the people were baptized, it came to paſs, that Jeſus alſo being baptized, &c.

15. Chap. vii. 29, 30. And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, juſtified God, being baptized with the baptiſm of John. But the *Phariſees* and *lawyers* rejected the counſel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of him.

16. Chap. xx. 4. The baptiſm of John, was it from heaven, or of men?

17. John i. 25, 26. Why baptizeſt thou then, if thou be not that Chriſt, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John anſwered them, ſaying, I baptize with water.

18. Ver. 28. Beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

19. Ver. 31. That he ſhould be made manifeſt to Iſrael, therefore am I come baptizing with water.

20. Ver. 33. He that ſent me to baptize with water.

21. Chap. iii. 5. Except a man be born of *water*, and of the Spirit, &c.

22. Ver. 22. After theſe things came Jeſus and his diſciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized.

23. Ver. 23. And John alſo was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, becauſe there was *much water there;* and they came, and were baptized.

24. Ver. 26. Behold, the ſame baptizeth, and all men come to him.

25. Chap. iv. 1, 2, The Phariſees had heard that Jeſus made and baptized more diſciples than John, (though Jeſus himſelf baptized not, but his diſciples.)

26. Chap. x. 40. Beyond Jordan, into the place where John at firſt baptized.

27. Acts i. 5. John truly baptized with water.

28. Ver. 22. Beginning from the baptiſm of John.

29. Chap. ii. 38. Then Peter ſaid unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt,—and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.

30. Ver. 41. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.

31. Chap. viii. 12, 13. But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jeſus Chriſt, they were baptized, both men and women. Then Simon himſelf believed alſo; and when he was baptized, &c.

32. Ver. 16. Only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jeſus.

33. Ver. 36—39. And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch ſaid, See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, If thou believeſt with all thine heart, thou mayeſt. And he anſwered and ſaid, I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to ſtand ſtill: and they went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, &c.

34. Chap. ix. 18. And he (Saul) aroſe, and was baptized.

35. Chap. x. 37. After the baptiſm which John preached.

36. Ver. 47, 48. Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.

37. Chap. xi. 16. John indeed baptized with water.

38. Chap. xiii. 24. When John had firſt preached, before his coming, the baptiſm of repentance to all the people.

39. Chap. xvi. 15. And when ſhe (Lydia) was baptized, and her houſehold.

40. Ver. 33. And was baptized, he (the jailer) and all his, ſtraightway.

41. Chap. xviii. 8. And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.

42. Ver. 25. He (Apollos) ſpake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing *only* the baptiſm of John.

43. Chap. xix. 3, 4, 5. Unto what then were ye baptized? And they ſaid, Unto John's baptiſm. Then ſaid Paul, John verily baptized with the baptiſm of repentance, ſaying unto the people, That they ſhould believe on him which ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jeſus.

44. Chap. xxii. 16. And now, why tarrieſt thou? ariſe, and be baptized, and *waſh away* thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord.

45. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Know ye not, that ſo many of us as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptiſm into death, &c.

46. Ver. 5. If we have been planted together in the likeneſs of his death, &c.

47. 1 Cor. i. 13—17. Were ye baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you but Criſpus and Gaius; let any ſhould ſay that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized alſo the houſehold of Stephanas: beſides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the goſpel.

48. Chap. vi. 11. But ye are waſhed.

49. Chap. xv. 29. Elſe what ſhall they do which are baptized for the dead?

50. Gal. iii. 27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt have put on Chriſt.

51. Eph. iv. 5. One baptiſm.

52. Chap. v. 26. That he might ſanctify and cleanſe it (the church) with the waſhing of water by the word.

53. Col. ii. 12. Buried with him in baptiſm, wherein alſo ye are riſen with him.

54. Titus iii. 5. According to his mercy he ſaved us, by the waſhing of regeneration, &c.

55. Heb. x. 22. Our *bodies waſhed* with pure water.

56. 1 Peter iii. 21. The like figure whereunto even baptiſm doth alſo now ſave us.

Here, my dear Sir, you have in plain view directly before you all the Bible, ſo far as it reſpects the matter of goſpel baptiſm.

The court to which you have appealed is now opened. Now ſelect your witneſſes, and have your evidence ready; for to trial you muſt come. Every text is allowed to be a good witneſs, and to poſſeſs evidence ſufficient to ſet the accuſed free, upon bearing teſtimony in his favour.

You are now, Sir, upon your trial before the court of Truth; charged with *violating* and *profaning* the *firſt goſpel ordinance*.

Say you, Guilty or not guilty? You ſay, Not guilty.

Then the trial muſt proceed.

Where is your text, your witneſs, which by example, by precept, or by intuitive conſequence, teſtifies that *ſprinkling*, or *partial waſhing*, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is *goſpel baptiſm*. Name your texts, your witneſſes. Call them *one* by *one*. Call them all, if you pleaſe.

Mat. iii. 5, 6, 7. is the firſt. What ſays this witneſs? Then went out unto him Jeruſalem, and Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, &c. Call all the other witneſſes, from Matthew to Peter.

The witneſſes having been ſeverally called, and the teſtimony of each ſeparately taken—

Court. You, S. A. *ſuppoſed* that theſe witneſſes, at leaſt ſome of them, would have ſpoken in your favour: but *ſuppoſitions* do not paſs for evidence at this court. What have your witneſſes teſtified? The teſtimony of each, as it reſpects your practice, is *Tekel—Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.*

Now, Sir, for the *trial* of *immerſion* for goſpel baptiſm. Call the witneſſes one by one. The witneſſes being called, the teſtimony of each is, My plain and common ſenſe of the caſe is, that immerſion is goſpel baptiſm. Call ſome of the witneſſes again. Call Mark i. 5. This witneſs teſtifies, that he ſaw John baptizing a multitude of his diſciples IN the river of Jordan. Call Mark i. 9. The teſtimony of this witneſs is, that he ſaw John baptizing the *Head* and *Huſband* of the *Church*, Jeſus Chriſt, IN *Jordan;* and that he ſaw him, after the ordinance was adminiſtered, *coming up ſtraightway out of the water.* Call Heb. x. 22. This witneſs affirmeth, that in goſpel baptiſm the ſubjects had their bodies waſhed with pure water. Call 1 Peter iii. 21. The teſtimony of this witneſs is, that as Noah was ſaved in the ark from a drowning world, ſo are the baptized ſaved in the water from a burning world: that is, baptiſm being an *antilupon* or figure, anſwering to the figure the ark, it figuratively points out the Saviour's purpoſe of ſaving his diſciples from a fiery deluge, which ſhall burn up the world and deſtroy the ungodly. He, therefore, as a token of his great kindneſs, directs that they be put all under water in baptiſm; that not ſo much as an hair ſhould be ſinged, or the ſmell of fire paſs on them.

Immerſion being tried, is found perfectly innocent, and is pronounced to be the matter of goſpel baptiſm.

Shouldſt thou, S. A. yet heſitate whether *ſprinkling* may not, in ſpecial inſtances, be allowed, another witneſs muſt be again called. Call Eph. iv. 5. One Lord, one faith, *one baptiſm.*

Court. Our judgment is, that the *error* of S. A. hath no countenance, from any precept, example, or fair conſequence, from any thing which hath been ſaid or done by Jeſus Chriſt, or any of his inſpired ſervants.

HAST thou appealed unto the BIBLE? unto the BIBLE ſhalt thou go.

Pleaſe to attend to the following, and the BIBLE you will ſee for the *Subjects* of *Goſpel Baptiſm.*

Here, Sir, is, if I miſtake not, every text in which the BIBLE manifeſtly defines the *ſubjects* of goſpel baptiſm.

1. Mat. iii. 7, 8, 9. When he ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadducees come to his baptiſm, he ſaid unto them, O generation of vipers! who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance: and *think not* to *ſay* within yourſelves, *We have Abraham to our father.*

2. Ver. 11. I indeed baptize you with water unto *repentance.*

3. Chap. xxviii. 19. Go ye, therefore, and *teach* all nations, baptizing them in the name, &c.

4. Mark i. 4, 5. John did baptize in the wilderneſs, and preach the baptiſm of *repentance* for the *remiſſion* of ſins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jeruſalem, and were all baptized of him IN the river of Jordan, *confeſſing their ſins.*

5. Chap. xvi. 15, 16. And he ſaid unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature. He that *believeth*, and is baptized, &c.

6. Luke iii. 7, 8, 9. Then ſaid he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers! who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, *fruits worthy* of repentance; and begin not to ſay within yourſelves, *We* have Abraham to our father. — And now alſo the axe is laid unto the *root* of the *trees*, &c.

7. Ver. 12. Then came alſo publicans to be baptized, and ſaid unto him, Maſter, *what* ſhall *we do?*

8. Chap. vii. 29, 30. And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, juſtified God, being baptized with the baptiſm of John. But the *Phariſees* and *lawyers rejected* the *counſel* of God *againſt themſelves*, *being not* baptized of him.

9. John iii. 5. Except a man be born of *water*, and of the Spirit, &c.

10. Chap. iv. 1. Jeſus *made* and *baptized* more *diſciples* than John.

11. Acts ii. 38. Then Peter ſaid unto them, *Repent*, and be *baptized* every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the *remiſſion* of *ſins*, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.

12. Ver. 41. Then they that *gladly received* his word were *baptized*.

13. Chap. viii. 12, 13. But when they *believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jeſus Chriſt, they were baptized, both men and women. Then Simon himſelf believed alſo; and when he was baptized, &c.

14. Ver. 36, 37. What doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, If thou *believeſt* with all thine heart, thou mayeſt. And he (the eunuch) anſwered and ſaid, I *believe* that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.

15. Chap. x. 48. Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have *received* the *Holy Ghoſt* as well as we?

16. Chap. xiii. 24. When John had firſt preached, before his coming, the *baptiſm* of *repentance* to all the people.

17. Chap. xvi. 14, 15. A certain woman named Lydia, a ſeller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, who *worſhipped* God, heard us; whoſe heart the Lord opened, that ſhe attended unto the things which were ſpoken of Paul. And when ſhe was baptized, and her houſehold, &c.

18. Ver. 33, 34. And was baptized, he (the jailer) and all his, ſtraightway. And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them, and *rejoiced*, *believing* in *God with all his houſe*.

19. Chap. xviii. 8. And many of the Corinthians *hearing*, *believed*, and were *baptized*.

20. Chap. xix. 4, 5. John *verily baptized* with the baptiſm of *repentance*, ſaying unto the people, That they *ſhould believe* on him which ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus. When they heard this, they were baptized, &c.

21. Chap. xxii. 16. And now, why *tarrieſt thou? ariſe*, and be baptized, and *waſh* away thy *ſins*, calling on the name of the Lord.

22. Rom. vi. 3, 4. *Know ye not*, that ſo many of *us* as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptiſm into death; that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life.

23. Gal. iii. 27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt have put on Chriſt.

24. 1 Peter iii. 21. The like figure whereunto even baptiſm doth now ſave us, (*not* the putting away of the filth of the fleſh, but the *anſwer* of a *good* conſcience toward God,) by the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt.

Here, Sir, you behold, in full view, the court to which you have appealed, to be again in ſeſſion.

Before this court you, Sir, ſtand indicted for the following high crimes or miſdemeanors: 1. For teaching the people to miſunderſtand the laws of Chriſt's kingdom: 2. For doing what you could to bring into this kingdom thoſe who have no goſpel liberty to come: 3. For ſome public attempts to prolong and to increaſe the blindneſs of many, as to the ſubjects of goſpel baptiſm.

You are now ſet before the court of TRUTH for your trial.

What ſay you to the indictment? Guilty, or not guilty?

Anſ. Not guilty.

Then you muſt be proved guilty.

You, as a teacher of the goſpel, have taught the people, that the children of believers were to be baptized, on account of their parents' faith.

Court. Read the laws of Chriſt's kingdom. The laws being read—Not a word is found for you, but much againſt you; particularly the ſtatutes recorded Mat. iii. 7, 8, 9. Luke iii. 7, 8, 9. and in ſeveral other places: you, therefore, ſtand convicted of the firſt clauſe of the indictment.

As to the ſecond clauſe of the indictment—you have baptized or ſprinkled infants and unbelieving children, and thus *intentionally* brought them into Chriſt's kingdom, or done what you could to place them there.

Court. You confeſs the fact, but plead that the laws of Chriſt's kingdom enjoin the practice. Read the laws, that the perſon on trial may be convicted from the mouth of the law. The laws are read—Not a word is found for infant baptiſm, baptiſm for believers' children, or for unbelievers' baptiſm of any kind. The law ſpeaks of the baptiſm of believers, and gives liberty for none beſides. Hence, you ſtand convicted of practiſing the traditions of men: which was, for ſubſtance, the ſecond clauſe of the indictment.

As for the laſt clauſe, it is a fact of ſuch public notoriety, you will to that readily plead guilty; otherwiſe, your Letters to D. M. with the Appendix, will be laid before the court. What ſay you? *Anſ.* Guilty.

Court. The judgment of this court is, that thou, S. A. art guilty, in both matter and form, as ſet forth in the indictment.

HAST thou appealed unto the BIBLE? unto the BIBLE ſhalt thou go.

Pleaſe to attend to the following, and you will ſee the BIBLE for *Communicants*.

The following, if I miſtake not, is the whole BIBLE, ſo far as it ſpeaks of the Lord's ſupper, and defines the qualifications of the accepted gueſts.

1. Mat. xxvi. 26, 27, 28. And as they were eating, Jeſus took bread, and bleſſed it, and brake it, and gave it to the diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the new teſtament, which is ſhed for many, for the remiſſion of ſins.

2. Mark xiv. 22, 23, 24. And as they did eat, Jeſus took bread, and bleſſed, and brake it, and gave to them, and ſaid, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it: and he ſaid unto them, This is my blood of the new teſtament, which is ſhed for many.

3. Luke xxii. 19, 20. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, ſaying, This is my body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewiſe alſo the cup, after ſupper, ſaying, This cup is the new teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you.

4. Acts ii. 41, 42. Then they that gladly received his word were *baptized:* and the *ſame day* there were added unto them about three thouſand ſouls. And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the apoſtles' doctrine and fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.

5. Ver. 46, 47. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and *breaking bread* from houſe to houſe. — And the Lord *added* to the *church* daily *ſuch* as ſhould be ſaved.

6. Chap. xx. 7, 11. And upon the firſt day of the week, when the diſciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his ſpeech until midnight. When he had *broken bread,* and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, ſo he departed.

7. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt? the *bread*

which we *break*, is it not the *communion* of the body of Chriſt? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body: for *we are all partakers* of that one *bread*.

8. Chap. xi. 16, 20. But if any man ſeem to be contentious, we have no ſuch *cuſtom*, neither the churches of God. When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's ſupper.

9. Ver. 23—29. For I have received of the Lord that which alſo I delivered unto you—That the Lord Jeſus, the ſame night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks he brake it, and ſaid, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the ſame manner alſo he took the cup, when he had ſupped, ſaying, This cup is the new teſtament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whoſoever ſhall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, ſhall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lord's body.

Here, Sir, you behold the court to which you have appealed, once more convened, for your trial.

You now ſtand before this court, to anſwer to the following indictment.

Thou art accuſed of having inſinuated, before the friends and enemies of king Jeſus, that he hath left the *order* of his houſe and worſhip at ſuch looſe ends, that it cannot be determined, from the rules given, in what order the two great goſpel ordinances are to be adminiſtered—whether the firſt laſt, or the laſt firſt; or whether it be of any conſequence which ſhall have the priority: that is, whether baptiſm ſhall precede the Lord's ſupper, or the Lord's ſupper precede baptiſm; or whether it be of conſequence which ſhall be firſt.

Counſellor. Sir, every dictate of prudence ſtrongly ſuggeſts to you, that your wiſdom is, to plead guilty, and caſt yourſelf upon the mercy of the court. Should you not, out of your own mouth you will be condemned. Your Letters to D. M. and your Appendix, both pronounce you, Guilty, guilty.

Court. What ſay you? Guilty, or not guilty?

Anſ. Guilty.

Court. Read all the King's laws which relate to the ſubject, for the violation of which S. A. hath been here indicted, and to which indictment he pleads guilty; that if he will ſhow himſelf an honeſt man, he may be no more arraigned before us for any ſimilar miſdemeanors. Read diſtinctly Mat. xxvi. 26, 27, 28. Mark xiv. 22, 23. &c. Doſt thou, S. A. ſee, and perfectly underſtand, that there is no law, ſtatute, or clauſe, which affords the leaſt poſſible plea, that any ever was, or of right ſhould be, admitted to the table of the Lord, before he ſubmitted to the ordinance of baptiſm? and that the order of Chriſt's houſe is plainly ſet forth? Is farther light needed? read Luke vii. 29, 30; read alſo Luke i. 17. where John's work is deſcribed to be to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. Read alſo what took place whilſt John was making ready this people, and preparing them for the Lord, Mat. iii. 1—6. John preached repentance, and the baptiſm of repentance, and baptized them IN the river of Jordan. Read again, Acts ii. 41, 42. They that gladly received his word were baptized, &c.

Court. Thou, S. A. haſt been indicted before this court—1. For having perverted the goſpel baptiſm, by changing it for ſprinkling, an invention of men—2. For pleading that you, and conſequently that your children, have Abraham to your father, and that on this account they were fit ſubjects of goſpel baptiſm, and that in this way thou haſt violated the laws of Chriſt, as to the ſubjects of baptiſm—3. For having impeached the honour of the Chriſtian Lawgiver, by teaching that matters were left by him at uncertainties, what and how things ſhould be done in his houſe and kingdom, the church, and for ſeveral other collateral offences. Thou didſt well by appealing to this court, that thou mighteſt have a full hearing, and receive judgment without partiality. This court having taken every part of each trial, had before them, into full conſideration, find thee, S. A. *guilty*, *guilty*, *guilty*, as ſet forth in the ſeveral indictments. The ſentence which the court ſhall inflict on thee, will not be publickly pronounced this day: the court, however, from motives of compaſſion, ſee fit to inform thee, that ſhould repentance, manifeſted by reformation, be found in thee, their ſentence will be mixed with very much mercy.

Thou art now permitted to go, for a few days, whither thou wilt, and no man ſhall hurt thee, provided thou haſt continually about thee the King's laws, which thou haſt violated, and do not openly tranſgreſs them in future.

THE principal part of what I purpoſed to ſay to you, Sir, in the public hearing, I have now ſaid: you muſt, however, permit me to ſay a few things more.

Among the many things which might be mentioned to profit, the following only will find place for the preſent.

1. It is worthy of the reader's particular obſervation, that you have not found ſo much as one text, which ſays ſo much as one word about ſprinkling as being goſpel baptiſm; not one precept, not one example, nor one plain conſequence, which ſhows ſprinkling to be from heaven: and had you not forbidden me to go to Rome, I could have ſhown that ſprinkling for baptiſm was one of the children of the man of ſin. It muſt appear a ſingular matter, to every perſon of diſcernment, that you ſhould forbid me to go to the ancient fathers, to prove your practice to be of men, when you, at the ſame time, take the liberty to bring in the modern fathers, to ſhow your doctrine from heaven. Do you not know, Sir, that in this particular you have exactly imitated the pope and his clergy? They would not ſubmit to have their errors confronted by the writings of the ancient fathers, but they would prove the purity of their preſent practice, becauſe his holineſs the pope, and his holy catholic church, have thus practiſed for many years.

2. It is not unworthy of critical attention, why you have not, and why you cannot, produce one Scripture precept, example, or fair conſequence, to prove that ever one infant, child, or ſervant, or ſoldier, was baptized upon the faith of another, or becauſe the parent, maſter, captain, or ſome other perſon believed. The reaſon why you produced no ſcripture which was to your point, is but too manifeſt; you had none to bring.

3. Another conſideration you are deſired to take into ſerious and immediate contemplation: it is this—You are accountable, not to men only, but to the Lord, for your ſuppoſititious attempts to keep the ignorant and credulous in the belief and practice of their ſuperſtitious and antichriſtian traditions. If you have any thing in favour of infant ſprinkling, or infant baptiſm, which can bear the light of truth, we wiſh you to uſher it forth to public view as ſoon as poſſible: but if you have nothing but conjectures, ſuppoſitions, and dubious, uncertain conſequences, we wiſh you to let them ſleep in their native darkneſs; for as often as you, or your brethren, make ſuch dark and benighted attempts, to palm upon the Chriſtian world the inventions of

men for the ordinances of Heaven, you reproach your Maker. His ordinances and poſitive inſtitutions never did, do not now, and never will, ſtand in need of ſuch blind arguments to give them currency; the bare ſuppoſition that they do, is a reflection upon his benevolence, or upon his wiſdom.

4. Another thought I wiſh to ſuggeſt, for your conſideration: it is this—Should you be diſſatisfied with the judgment which the Scriptures have paſſed upon your traditionary practices, you are deſired to remember, that *by them you and your works* are to be tried; and happy for you, if your works only ſhall be burnt up. It will be for you but a poor plea, at the judgment, to ſay, Many, of reputation, believed and practiſed with you. You have appealed to the Bible; if you will hearken to it, it will be well; otherwiſe, the blood of many may be required at your hands. I ſincerely wiſh that you may repent of your deeds, and yet be a burning and a ſhining light in ſome golden candleſtick. Not that you might believe as I do, but that you might believe and practiſe as the goſpel enjoins, and no more wound the *ſuffering flock* of God, and cauſe the daughters of the uncircumciſed to rejoice, and the hypocrites and unbelievers to triumph over the church.

What yet remains to be laid before you, is a few deductions or conſequences from what we have paſſed over.

1. The ſum total of your arguments againſt the reaſonings in my Sermons, is a *collection* of *ſuppoſitions*, which you ſay are *miſerable arguments*.

2. Your Examination of my Sermons hath a tendency to lengthen, and perhaps to augment, the difference between your denomination and the Baptiſts; but it hath no direct aptitude towards ſettling the diſpute. The Baptiſts are, generally ſpeaking, determined to abide by the judgment of the court of truth; before which both your pamphlet and your practice have been tried and condemned.

3. Another conſequence is, that you have darkened the counſel of the Lord by words without knowledge: this is the beſt which we can ſay of your performance, ſeeing by it you have attempted to turn us from the right ways of the Lord.

4. Another conſequence is, you have, ſo far as you could, taken from the people the *key* of knowledge, by repreſenting plain truths in ſuch a wrong manner, as to lead your prejudiced readers to believe, that there is very little or no truth

revealed, as to the important ſubjects on which you have written.

5. You have implicitly contradicted the Bible, in that you have obviouſly intimated that there are divers kinds of Chriſtian baptiſms, when the Bible ſays, One baptiſm.

6. It appears that you have done what you could to remove the land-mark of the King of Iſrael: you have, without authority, and contrary from the plain tenor of the New Teſtament, informed us, that perſons may be members of the viſible church of Chriſt, and not yet baptized. Beſides, you have ſpoken lightly, or at leaſt very inconſiderately, of the divine rite of Chriſtian baptiſm; you have treated it as being, in a great degree, an uncertain and unimportant ordinance.

7. Another conſequence is, that unleſs your traditionary rite of ſprinkling, your tradition of infant baptiſm, and your *newly invented ſcheme* of *admitting unbaptized* perſons to the Lord's table, can obtain a ſtronger ſupport than your ſuppoſitions, or others like them, they will all of them be treated as intruders, and relics of popery, ſo far as truth ſhall obtain a candid hearing.

8. You and your denomination not only reject the counſel of God againſt yourſelves, being not baptized, and ſo will not enter into the viſible kingdom of Chriſt, but them who are entering in ye hinder.

9. Another deduction, which appears naturally to flow from what hath been ſaid, is, that had you been on Bible ground, the Scriptures would not have failed you on every point, ſo as not to have lent you one fair argument, either from precept or fact, or from intuitive conſequence. But, Sir, the fact is too notorious for you honourably to deny it, that you have not even ſo much as one fair argument from the Bible, (and you have appealed to it,) to ſupport either ſprinkling, infant baptiſm, or unbaptized church members, or for communion with thoſe who reject the counſel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized, only ſprinkled according to man's inventions.

10. The reaſon why you and many others have had ſo much difficulty in preventing Chriſtians of their ſocieties from embracing immerſion, as goſpel baptiſm, is becauſe it is ſo plainly taught in the Bible. We likewiſe ſee the foundation of your difficulty, in ſatisfying your hearers that *ſprinkling*, *man's ſubſtitute* for baptiſm, will anſwer for the firſt Chriſtian ordinance: it is this—nothing is found in the Bible

for this ſprinkling ſubſtitute, which is faſt going into diſrepute; it will ſoon be in perpetual diſgrace.

11. Another deduction is, that the public ſhould be advertized, that, ſhould you preſent them with your propoſed volume, they are not to expect, that when you treat on baptiſm, on the ſubjects of baptiſm, or on unbaptized church members, or on unbaptized communicants, that you will produce one plain text from the Bible, to prove your ſentiments correct; but that they will probably find many texts, which have no direct connexion with either of the ſubjects, produced to prove each, reſpectively; for the public ought not to expect impoſſibilities: and as the Bible is *totally*, *totally* ſilent, as to countenancing either of the ſubjects, which you expect to ſet in a clear point of view, no text, direct for either of them, can juſtly be looked for.

You do, indeed, Sir, appear to me to poſſeſs a curious poſition: for you would make a ſingular figure before the public, ſhould you go to Greece or Rome, to popes or cardinals, councils or conclaves for evidence, ſince you have forbidden me to argue from any ſimilar ſource; and, at the ſame time, you have appealed to the Bible, and that hath nothing to ſay for you, directly or indirectly: you find nothing for you there, but ſilence on the one hand, and on the other many precepts and examples, enjoining it upon you to change both your words and practice. In this poſition, and thus circumſtanced, you are juſt publiſhing a volume to rectify miſtakes, and to ſet theſe controverted ſubjects in a clear point of view. You certainly would do well to conſult the Bible, and take advice of the Scriptures, before you proceed any farther. Curſed be he that *handleth* the *word* of God, or *doeth his work, deceitfully*.

Laſtly. Another conſequence is, that every perſon may conſider himſelf to be again at full liberty to read my Seven Sermons, if he pleaſe: for though there be but *little* of *argument* in *them*, yet your Examination is found not to be able to diſprove *that little*. It is, therefore, obvious that they poſſeſs as much of argument as they ever did, together with this advantageous circumſtance, that they have, without receiving material injury, ſuſtained the firſt public general attack. Nor will you, or any of your denomination, be ever able to deſtroy the immovable *baſis* on which the principal arguments in my Sermons are founded. Their foundation is the broad baſis of revelation. Would you maintain

your ground, in this day of *light*, *liberty*, and *inquiry*, it would probably be your wiſdom, to be as *totally* ſilent, as to any mention of your errors, as the Scriptures are with relation to any defence of them.

With grief for your errors,
with affection for your perſon,
with eſteem for your general character,
and deſires for your ſpeedy reformation,
I am, dear Sir, ſincerely yours,

DANIEL MERRILL.

A few words for Rev. SAMUEL WORCESTER, of Salem.

THE author of the foregoing Letters does moſt ſincerely regret, that any perſonal and public abuſe and obloquy ſhould be reſorted to by Mr. Worceſter, of Salem, in defence of the preſent very intereſting and ſolemn controverſy. He alſo ſincerely regrets, that the ſame Mr. Worceſter ſhould publiſh to the world ſeveral unfounded aſſertions, or great miſrepreſentations, that he might in this way ſupport his unſtable cauſe. Truth wants no ſuch auxiliaries, and error cannot be always ſupported by them.

The following are conſidered to be unfounded aſſertions, or great miſrepreſentations.

1. Says Mr. Worceſter,* "Even the author of Seven Sermons, on the mode and ſubjects of baptiſm, *deſires* to *thank God* that he knows the *Greek as well as any man.*"

2. The ſame Mr. Worceſter informs the public,† that the "author of Letters to Mr. Anderſon, has not only *gratuitouſly coined*, and *contemptuouſly* beſtowed upon us a new name, but becauſe he found that John, the harbinger of Chriſt, is called a Baptiſt, very ſhrewdly concludes thoſe who were baptized by John were alſo Baptiſts, &c.; but upon being aſked, by the author of *theſe diſcourſes*, whether the term Baptiſt was applied to John in the ſame ſenſe in which it is now applied to thoſe who are called Baptiſts, he *confeſſed the truth, and ſaid it was not.*"

3. The ſame Mr. Worceſter tells us, page 62, that "the ſame reaſoning, *if reaſoning it muſt be called*, by which it was ſuppoſed to be proved that the Waldenſes, Wickliffites, Huſſites, and other witneſſes for the truth in the *dark ages*, were Antipædobaptiſts, would equally prove that the Tabernacle church are Antipædobaptiſts. This the writer of the Miniature Hiſtory has *himſelf* been *brought* to *acknowledge.*"

Had theſe unfounded aſſertions, or great miſrepreſentations, of Mr. Worceſter's, affected merely the private character and feelings of him whom they implicate, he might have left them, after denying their correctneſs, to the future conſideration of Mr. Worceſter, and to the juſt cenſure of every candid writer and reader of theological diſputation. But when a public teacher of religion ſhall practiſe ſuch kind of management, to prepoſſeſs and to prejudice the minds of his hearers and readers againſt the truth, he ought to expect ſome ſuitable correction. This the author of the Miniature Hiſtory, and of the Letters to Mr. Anderſon, expects to endeavour, as ſoon as he ſhall have leiſure. In the mean time, Mr. Worceſter is called upon to make his aſſertions good, if he be able to: he is deſired, however, to do it in ſuch a manner, that the public may not conſider him to be contending with an enemy, nor with one whom he may with impunity treat with contempt.

---

* *See his Diſcourſes, page 69.*

† *Diſcourſes, page 66.*

The author of the Miniature History takes liberty just to observe, that he does not believe, also that he never did believe, and that he never acknowledged, that the same reasoning by which the Waldenses, &c. were proved to be Antipædobaptists, would prove the Tabernacle church in Salem to be so: nor did he ever make any similar concession, but upon supposition that this proposition of Mr. Worcester's was correct—*That the Tabernacle church held to the same great and leading maxim with the Waldenses*, &c.; which the author considered, and still considers, to be Mr. Worcester's mistake.

This maxim of the Waldenses, &c. is, "*That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church, he had established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.*"

Let Mr. Worcester show, if he can, that the Tabernacle church adopt this maxim, not in *part*, but in *whole*, and that their practice does, in fact, correspond with it, and that thoroughly; then shall it be conceded to him, that, so far as the argument depends on this great leading maxim, the same reasoning which proves the Waldenses, &c. to be Antipædobaptists, will prove the Tabernacle church to be so.

The author of Letters to Mr. Anderson also takes liberty to observe, that his sentiment of John's being called the Baptist is, that he was thus called because he *baptized*, and that every Baptist minister is called a Baptist for the same identical reason for which John was thus called; and that the brethren among the Baptists are thus called, not because they are *baptizers*, but because they are *baptized*.

The author of the Seven Sermons, Miniature History, &c. never uttered or published the expression in the first great misrepresentation of Mr. Worcester,* nor made concessions or acknowledgments to him, but in agreement with the above statement. Mr. Worcester will account to himself, to his people, and to the public, for his assertions, in the best manner he can.

One acknowledgment I most frankly make to Mr. Worcester: it is this—That I am really pained that he hath compelled me thus publickly to contradict his public statements. The fault is his, and the damage he will sustain.

THE AUTHOR.

Sedgwick, December 25, 1805.

---

* *I may, when urged by blind gainsayers, have said something to the following purport—That I understood the Greek words which relate to the ordinance of baptism, as well as do the opposers; but never did I say, or intentionally so much as intimate, what Mr. Worcester most ungenerously and manifestly charges to my account.*